RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 10, Page 707-717 | Article No. 79
DOI: 10.4898/jenerv2i10.a79
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

The Practices Employed by the School Heads in the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in the Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Camarines Norte

Janice II Derez Quiñones[1]

[1]School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: October 2026

Keywords:
School Heads' Implementation of The School-Based Management Framework
Philippines
School-Based Survey
Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance
Teacher Perceptions

ABSTRACT

The study assessed school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) framework in public elementary schools in the Division of Camarines Norte. The survey involved 256 school heads and used a descriptive–evaluative–correlational design, a five-point questionnaire and rank-concordance analysis. The reported implementation summary was Very Much Implemented (4.69), with resource management highest (4.75) and stakeholder engagement lowest (4.66). Practices employed by school heads were likewise rated Very Much Employed (4.79), led by finance and resource management and mobilization (4.85) and followed by learning environment (4.80). The study also identified implementation problems and proposed solutions. Findings concern school heads' reported practices, not independent accreditation judgments or demonstrated causal effects on pupil learning.

1. Introduction

In the Philippine basic education system, school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework is situated at the intersection of classroom practice, school policy and local resource conditions. The way educational practices are organized within a district cannot be inferred from national policy statements alone; information on local implementation and the views of the personnel responsible for delivery is also necessary. The study therefore focused on public elementary schools in the Division of Camarines Norte, a setting in which the routines supporting curriculum and instruction, stakeholder engagement and implementation problems and proposed solutions can vary across schools.

The phenomenon examined by the study involves more than the presence of a program or institutional requirement. What respondents recognize as frequent, substantial or effective practice may depend on exposure, school size, resource access, the specific indicator being rated and the standards used for judging it. For this reason, evidence about school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework must distinguish the extent of reported implementation from measurable changes in teachers' work or learners' outcomes. The ratings obtained in a cross-sectional questionnaire provide one form of evidence, but not every form required for a causal claim.

The study organized its inquiries around substantive domains rather than a single unqualified effectiveness score. The domains included curriculum and instruction, leadership and governance, resource management, stakeholder engagement. Considering these areas separately makes it possible to identify strengths and weaknesses that may be hidden by a favorable overall mean. It also allows school leaders to direct follow-up observation and support toward specific activities instead of treating all facets of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework as interchangeable.

A second analytical concern was whether respondent groups ranked the indicators similarly. Concordance across group rankings addresses the consistency of priorities or perceptions, not the magnitude of implementation or a relationship between an intervention and an educational outcome. Accordingly, the study treated means and ranks as descriptive indicators while interpreting the significance tests within the narrower meaning of Kendall's coefficient of concordance.

The study is also relevant to established educational guidance. The relevant work by Department of Education, 2012 sets out a policy or research framework against which reported practices may be considered. Such guidance offers analytical context without transforming survey responses into direct observational evidence. The research questions therefore concerned the extent of practices in the specified setting, respondent-group agreement about their ordering, and implications for local educational improvement.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study adopted a descriptive–evaluative–correlational questionnaire survey with a five-point rating scale. It investigated school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework in public elementary schools in the Division of Camarines Norte during the study period. The design was observational. Although the term "correlational" appeared in the design description, the inferential results reported in the study primarily concerned agreement among ranked indicators; the resulting statistics did not estimate causal effects or the strength of a learner-level association.

2.2 Participants and sampling

The reported study participants consisted of 256 school heads. Respondents were grouped by the school classifications or school groupings shown in the results. Survey estimates should be read in light of the actual respondent composition rather than as probability-sample estimates for all Philippine schools. Where the study did not provide distinct pupil assessments or repeated measures, teachers' accounts of student development were interpreted as perceptions.

2.3 Instrument and procedure

The study used a structured questionnaire or researcher-made rating scale encompassing the stated domains of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework. Item-level statements were evaluated through the verbal-response categories and weighted-mean interpretation bands displayed with the study tables. The study described instrument preparation and administration through participating schools and used grouped ratings to address the research questions. Reported validity, reliability and response-handling details were not independently reconstructed or substituted where documentation was incomplete.

2.4 Data treatment and interpretation

The study reported frequency, mean, weighted mean, ranking, Kendall's coefficient of concordance and chi-square. Weighted means described central tendencies in ordinal rating responses, while reported ranks established the relative order of indicators. Kendall's W described concordance in ranks across the specified school groups; related chi-square results were treated according to the reported thresholds. No new significance calculations, sample-based confidence intervals or unreported multivariable estimates were introduced. Tables reproduce printed figures, including any discrepancies requiring verification.

2.5 Ethical and reporting considerations

The study was reported using aggregated responses. Individual-level datasets, consent documentation, and institutional ethics reference numbers were not reproduced in the available study chapters, and none is supplied here as though verified. Interpretation avoids identifying individual teachers or learners and refrains from attributing perceived outcomes to the surveyed practices without appropriate longitudinal or comparative evidence.

3. Results

The tables present the numerical entries and response-scale labels reported for each domain. Domain-level means describe respondent ratings; significance tests refer to group rank concordance.

Table 1. The Extent of the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in terms of Curriculum and Instruction

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Aligns lesson plans and teaching activities with the prescribed curriculum.	4.92	VMI	2	4.71	VMI	4	4.91	VMI	1	4.85	VMI	1
2. Ensures that teachers regularly update and submit their lesson plans for review.	4.53	VMI	10	4.69	VMI	6	4.72	VMI	3	4.65	VMI	6.5
3. Supports the use of learner-centered and differentiated instructional strategies.	4.95	VMI	1	4.75	VMI	2.5	4.55	VMI	9	4.75	VMI	3
4. Monitors the integration of local context and learner needs in curriculum delivery.	4.59	VMI	8.5	4.60	VMI	8	4.32	MI	10	4.50	VMI	10
5. Provides teachers with resources and materials to enhance instruction.	4.59	VMI	8.5	4.88	VMI	1	4.68	VMI	7.5	4.69	VMI	5
6. Promotes the use of varied assessment tools to measure learners' progress.	4.80	VMI	4	4.78	VMI	2.5	4.83	VMI	2	4.70	VMI	2
7. Facilitates professional development sessions focused on curriculum implementation.	4.64	VMI	6.5	4.70	VMI	5	4.62	VMI	6	4.65	VMI	6.5
8. Encourages collaboration among teachers in planning and delivering lessons.	4.80	VMI	3	4.67	VMI	7	4.68	VMI	7.5	4.72	VMI	4
9. Evaluates the effectiveness of instructional practices in improving learning outcomes.	4.72	VMI	5	4.42	MI	9	4.68	VMI	4.5	4.60	VMI	8
10. Ensures alignment of cocurricular and extra-curricular activities with curriculum goals.	4.64	VMI	6.5	4.37	MI	10	4.68	VMI	4.5	4.56	VMI	9
Average Weighted Mean	4.73	VMI		4.65	VMI		4.65	VMI		4.68	VMI	

Legend:

4.50 - 5.00 Very Much Implemented (VMI)
3.50 - 4.49 Much Implemented (MI)
2.50 - 3.49 Implemented (I)
1.50 - 2.49 Fairly Implemented (FI)
1.00 - 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wx - Weighted Mean
I - Interpretation
R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with curriculum and instruction. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of curriculum and instruction would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 2. The Extent of the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in terms of Leadership and Governance

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Demonstrates clear vision and direction in implementing SBM initiatives.	4.50	VMI	9	4.76	VMI	6.5	4.51	VMI	7.5	4.59	VMI	8
2. Involves teachers, learners, and stakeholders in decision-making processes.	4.72	VMI	4	4.90	VMI	1	4.53	VMI	6	4.72	VMI	3
3. Ensures that school policies are aligned with SBM guidelines.	4.59	VMI	7.5	4.87	VMI	2	4.62	VMI	4	4.69	VMI	6
4. Delegates responsibilities effectively to promote shared leadership.	4.78	VMI	2	4.82	VMI	4	4.70	VMI	2	4.77	VMI	1
5. Monitors the performance of school personnel in relation to SBM objectives.	4.59	VMI	7.5	4.86	VMI	3	4.64	VMI	3	4.70	VMI	5
6. Establishes transparent and accountable governance practices.	4.77	VMI	3	4.80	VMI	5	4.55	VMI	5	4.71	VMI	4
7. Provides support and guidance to committees implementing SBM projects.	4.70	VMI	5	4.76	VMI	6.5	4.51	VMI	7.5	4.66	VMI	7
8. Facilitates regular meetings to discuss school improvement plans and progress.	4.65	VMI	6	4.75	VMI	8	4.15	MI	9	4.52	VMI	9
9. Promotes participatory leadership by encouraging suggestions and feedback.	4.85	VMI	1	4.63	VMI	9	4.79	VMI	1	4.76	VMI	2
Average Weighted Mean	**4.68**	**VMI**		**4.79**	**VMI**		**4.56**	**VMI**		**4.68**	**VMI**	

Legend:
4.50 - 5.00 Very Much Implemented (VMI)
3.50 - 4.49 Much Implemented (MI)
2.50 - 3.49 Implemented (I)
1.50 - 2.49 Fairly Implemented (FI)
1.00 - 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wx - Weighted Mean
I - Interpretation
R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with leadership and governance. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of leadership and governance would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 3. The Extent of the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in terms of Resource Management

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Allocates financial resources efficiently to support teaching and learning activities.	4.91	VMI	3	4.52	VMI	10	4.94	VMI	2	4.79	VMI	3.5
2. Ensures that instructional materials and supplies are available and properly maintained.	4.63	VMI	9	4.63	VMI	6	4.81	VMI	5	4.73	VMI	7
3. Manages physical resources, such as classrooms and facilities, to optimize learning.	4.72	VMI	6	4.85	VMI	2	4.83	VMI	4	4.80	VMI	2
4. Monitors the use of resources to prevent waste and misuse.	4.74	VMI	5	4.74	VMI	3	4.55	VMI	9	4.68	VMI	8.5
5. Prioritizes resource allocation based on learners' needs and school goals.	4.85	VMI	10	4.88	VMI	1	4.96	VMI	1	4.83	VMI	1
6. Maintains an inventory system for materials, equipment, and supplies.	4.95	VMI	1	4.63	VMI	8	4.77	VMI	6.5	4.78	VMI	5
7. Plans and implements the use of resources to support special programs and projects.	4.70	VMI	7.5	4.71	VMI	4	4.62	VMI	8	4.68	VMI	8.5
8. Encourages teachers and staff to utilize resources creatively and effectively.	4.92	VMI	2	4.68	VMI	7	4.77	VMI	6.5	4.79	VMI	3.5
9. Evaluates the adequacy and quality of resources to improve school operations.	4.70	VMI	7.5	4.70	VMI	5	4.85	VMI	3	4.75	VMI	6
10. Strengthens stakeholder partnerships to generate resources for school improvement and learner development.	4.84	VMI	4	4.62	VMI	9	4.51	VMI	10	4.66	VMI	10
Average Weighted Mean	**4.78**	**VMI**		**4.70**	**VMI**		**4.76**	**VMI**		**4.75**	**VMI**	

Legend:
4.50 - 5.00 Very Much Implemented (VMI)
3.50 - 4.49 Much Implemented (MI)
2.50 - 3.49 Implemented (I)
1.50 - 2.49 Fairly Implemented (FI)
1.00 - 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wx - Weighted Mean
I - Interpretation
R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with resource management. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of resource management would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 4. The Extent of the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in terms of Stakeholders' Engagement

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Actively involves parents in planning and decision-making processes.	4.57	VMI	9	4.53	VMI	7	4.72	VMI	2	4.61	VMI	8
2. Conducts regular consultations with teachers on school policies and programs.	4.62	VMI	7.5	4.73	VMI	2	4.64	VMI	4.5	4.66	VMI	4
3. Seeks input from learners in activities and programs that affect them.	4.73	VMI	4.5	4.41	VMI	9	4.57	VMI	7.5	4.57	VMI	9
4. Collaborates with community members in implementing school projects.	4.73	VMI	4.5	4.65	VMI	4	4.57	VMI	7.5	4.65	VMI	6
5. Maintains open communication channels with stakeholders regarding school developments.	4.78	VMI	3	4.74	VMI	1	4.66	VMI	3	4.73	VMI	2
6. Encourages stakeholders to participate in monitoring and evaluation of school programs.	4.62	VMI	7.5	4.71	VMI	3	4.64	VMI	4.5	4.66	VMI	4
7. Recognizes and appreciates contributions of stakeholders in school activities.	4.91	VMI	1	4.52	VMI	8	4.91	VMI	1	4.78	VMI	1
8. Organizes meetings or workshops to engage stakeholders in improving school performance.	4.69	VMI	2	4.56	VMI	5	4.53	VMI	9	4.66	VMI	4
9. Integrates stakeholder feedback in improving teaching and learning processes.	4.72	VMI	6	4.54	VMI	6	4.62	VMI	6	4.63	VMI	7
Average Weighted Mean	**4.73**	**VMI**		**4.63**	**VMI**		**4.65**	**VMI**		**4.66**	**VMI**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Implemented (VMI)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Implemented (MI)
2.50 – 3.49 Implemented (I)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Implemented (FI)
1.0 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wx – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with stakeholder engagement. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of stakeholder engagement would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 5. The Extent of the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in terms of Performance and Accountability

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Regularly sets clear performance targets for teachers and staff.	4.81	VMI	4.5	4.78	VMI	4	4.34	MI	10	4.64	VMI	8.5
2. Monitors and evaluates the achievement of set performance targets.	4.70	VMI	7	4.54	VMI	10	4.51	VMI	7	4.58	VMI	10
3. Ensures that teachers and staff are accountable for their assigned tasks.	4.84	VMI	2.5	4.77	VMI	5	4.53	VMI	6	4.71	VMI	4.5
4. Provides regular reports on the progress of school programs and initiatives.	4.68	VMI	9	4.74	VMI	6	4.72	VMI	4	4.71	VMI	4.5
5. Establishes performance standards aligned with DepEd policies.	4.74	VMI	6	4.66	VMI	9	4.81	VMI	2	4.74	VMI	3
6. Encourages teachers and staff to reflect on their performance for continuous improvement.	4.81	VMI	4.5	4.68	VMI	7.5	4.79	VMI	3	4.76	VMI	2
7. Recognizes and rewards individuals or groups who meet or exceed performance expectations.	4.84	VMI	2.5	4.80	VMI	2.5	4.36	VMI	9	4.67	VMI	7
8. Addresses gaps in performance through coaching, mentoring, or training.	4.69	VMI	8	4.82	VMI	1	4.55	VMI	5	4.69	VMI	6
9. Maintains transparency in decision-making and reporting of results.	4.88	VMI	1	4.68	VMI	7.5	4.87	VMI	1	4.81	VMI	1
10. Involves stakeholders in monitoring and evaluating school performance.	4.62	VMI	10	4.80	VMI	2.5	4.49	MI	8	4.64	VMI	8.5
Average Weighted Mean	**4.76**	**VMI**		**4.73**	**VMI**		**4.60**	**VMI**		**4.70**	**VMI**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Implemented (VMI)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Implemented (MI)
2.50 – 3.49 Implemented (I)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Implemented (FI)
1.00 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wx – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with performance and accountability. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of performance and accountability would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 6. The Summary of the Extent of the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM)Framework

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	
1. Curriculum and Instruction	4.73	VMI	3.5	4.65	VMI	4	4.65	VMI	2.5	4.68	VMI	3.5
2. Leadership and Governance	4.68	VMI	5	4.79	VMI	1	4.56	VMI	5	4.68	VMI	3.5
3. Resource Management	4.78	VMI	1	4.70	VMI	3	4.76	VMI	1	4.75	VMI	1
4. Stakeholders' Engagement	4.73	VMI	3.5	4.60	VMI	5	4.65	VMI	2.5	4.66	VMI	5
5. Performance and Accountability	4.76	VMI	2	4.73	VMI	2	4.60	VMI	4	4.70	VMI	2
Average Weighted Mean	**4.74**	**VMI**		**4.70**	**VMI**		**4.64**	**VMI**		**4.69**	**VMI**	

Legend:
4.50 - 5.00 Very Much Implemented (VMI)
3.50 - 4.49 Much Implemented (MI)
2.50 - 3.49 Implemented (I)
1.50 - 2.49 Fairly Implemented (FI)
1.00 - 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wx - Weighted Mean
I - Interpretation
R - Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes. An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting learning environment, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 7. The Test of Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of the Extent of the Implementation of the School-Based Management

Indicators	Curriculum and Instruction	Leadership and Governance	Resource Management	Stakeholders' Engagement	Performance and Accountability
Sum of the squared deviation from the difference (d^2)	303	233.50	109.50	146	155.50
Number of Groups	10	9	10	9	10
Number of Indicators	3	3	3	3	3
Coefficient of Concordance (W)	0.41	0.43	0.15	0.27	0.21
Computed Chi Square (X^2)	11.07	10.32	4.05	6.48	5.67
Degree of Freedom	9	8	9	8	9
Tabular x^2 Value with					
0.05	16.92	15.51	16.92	15.51	16.92
0.025	19.68	18.17	19.68	18.17	19.68
0.01	21.67	20.09	21.67	20.09	21.67
0.005	23.59	21.95	23.59	21.95	23.59
0.001	27.88	26.12	27.88	26.12	27.88
Decision on H_0	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance of Agreement	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on governance and accountability could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

Table 8. The Extent of the Practices Employed by the School Heads in the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework along Learning Envi

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R
1. Ensures that classrooms are safe, organized, and conducive to learning.	4.77	VME	3	4.91	VME	1	4.70	VME	7	4.79	VME	7.5
2. Promotes a positive and respectful atmosphere among learners and teachers.	4.82	VME	2.5	4.89	VME	2	4.60	VME	8	4.80	VME	5.5
3. Monitors the cleanliness and maintenance of school facilities.	4.84	VME	1.5	4.67	VME	8.5	4.90	VME	2	4.83	VME	4
4. Encourages the use of learning corners, displays, and instructional materials to enhance learning.	4.68	VME	4	4.80	VME	3	4.91	VME	1	4.73	VME	8
5. Supports teachers in creating inclusive classrooms that accommodate diverse learners.	4.78	VME	3	4.79	VME	4	4.85	VME	4	4.81	VME	3.5
6. Facilitates programs and activities that promote learners' well-being and engagement.	4.84	VME	1.5	4.67	VME	8.5	4.91	VME	3	4.81	VME	3.5
7. Observes classroom interactions to ensure a supportive and motivating environment.	4.92	VME	2.5	4.69	VME	7	5.00	VME	1	4.87	VME	1
8. Provides resources and guidance for improving the physical and instructional learning spaces.	4.95	VME	1	4.73	VME	6	4.72	VME	6	4.80	VME	5.5
9. Addresses issues that may disrupt the learning environment promptly and effectively.	4.80	VME	7	4.78	VME	5	4.79	VME	5	4.79	VME	7.5
Average Weighted Mean	**4.84**	**VME**		**4.77**	**VME**		**4.78**	**VME**		**4.80**	**VME**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Employed (VME)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Employed (ME)
2.50 – 3.49 Employed (E)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Employed (FE)
1.0 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wa – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with human resource and team development. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of human resource and team development would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 9. The Extent of the Practices Employed by the School Heads in the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework along Leadership

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R
1. Provides clear vision and direction for the implementation of SBM.	5.00	VME	1	4.95	VME	3	4.94	VME	1	4.93	VME	1
2. Motivates teachers and staff to actively participate in SBM initiatives.	4.77	VME	7	4.95	VME	3	4.79	VME	5.5	4.84	VME	2
3. Demonstrates decision-making that aligns with school goals and policies.	4.61	VME	10	4.88	VME	2	4.81	VME	4	4.77	VME	5.5
4. Facilitates collaboration among teachers, staff, and stakeholders in school programs.	4.86	VME	2	4.73	VME	6	4.74	VME	7	4.78	VME	6
5. Monitors the progress of SBM implementation and provides guidance when needed.	4.62	VME	9	4.74	VME	4.5	4.60	VME	8.5	4.65	VME	10
6. Encourages innovation and initiative in school improvement activities.	4.77	VME	7	4.69	VME	7	4.79	VME	5.5	4.75	VME	7
7. Communicates goals, plans, and expectations effectively to all members of the school community.	4.77	VME	7	4.74	VME	4.5	4.60	VME	8.5	4.70	VME	8
8. Ensures equitable distribution of responsibilities among teachers and staff.	4.81	VME	4	4.67	VME	8	4.57	VME	10	4.68	VME	9
9. Models ethical and professional behavior in all aspects of school leadership.	4.85	VME	3	4.84	VME	5	4.89	VME	3	4.79	VME	3
10. Empowers teachers, staff, and stakeholders to take active roles in SBM planning, implementation, and evaluation.	4.80	VME	5	4.60	VME	10	4.91	VME	2	4.77	VME	5.5
Average Weighted Mean	**4.79**	**VME**		**4.75**	**VME**		**4.76**	**VME**		**4.77**	**VME**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Employed (VME)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Employed (ME)
2.50 – 3.49 Employed (E)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Employed (FE)
1.00 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wa – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with financial and resource mobilization. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.
The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.
For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of financial and resource mobilization would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 10. The Extent of the Practices Employed by the School Heads in the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework along Finance and R

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Prepares and submits an annual budget aligned with school priorities.	4.80	VME	9	4.88	VME	4	4.79	VME	10	4.82	VME	10
2. Monitors the proper utilization of allocated funds.	4.81	VME	7	4.89	VME	3	4.94	VME	5	4.88	VME	2
3. Ensures transparency in financial transactions and reporting.	4.85	VME	5	4.93	VME	1	4.83	VME	8.5	4.87	VME	3.5
4. Mobilizes additional resources from stakeholders and the community.	4.80	VME	9	4.77	VME	10.5	4.96	VME	4	4.84	VME	8.5
5. Prioritizes expenditures based on the needs of learners and school programs.	4.91	VME	2.5	4.81	VME	7.5	4.98	VME	2.5	4.90	VME	1
6. Maintains accurate records of all financial and resource-related activities.	4.91	VME	2.5	4.81	VME	7.5	4.83	VME	8.5	4.85	VME	6.5
7. Allocates resources equitably to support teaching and learning.	4.80	VME	9	4.78	VME	9	5.00	VME	1	4.86	VME	5
8. Ensures timely disbursement of funds for school projects and activities.	4.82	VME	6	4.84	VME	5.5	4.89	VME	6	4.85	VME	6.5
9. Seeks partnerships or grants to augment school resources.	4.66	VME	11	4.77	VME	10.5	4.98	VME	2.5	4.80	VME	11
10. Monitors the maintenance and proper use of school facilities and materials.	4.89	VME	4	4.84	VME	5.5	4.87	VME	7	4.87	VME	3.5
11. Evaluates the effectiveness of resource management practices and implements improvements.	4.93	VME	1	4.90	VME	2	4.68	VME	11	4.84	VME	8.5
Average Weighted Mean	**4.83**	**VME**		**4.84**	**VME**		**4.89**	**VME**		**4.85**	**VME**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Employed (VME)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Employed (ME)
2.50 – 3.49 Employed (E)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Employed (FE)
1.00 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wx – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.
The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with implementation problems and proposed solutions. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.
The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.
For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of implementation problems and proposed solutions would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 11. The Summary of the Extent of the Practices Employed by the School Heads in the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Learning Environment	4.86	VME	1	4.77	VME	4	4.78	VME	2	4.80	VME	2
2. Leadership	4.79	VME	3	4.75	VME	5	4.78	VME	3	4.77	VME	3
3. Governance and Accountability	4.76	VME	4	4.79	VME	3	4.73	VME	4	4.76	VME	4.5
4. Human Resource and Team Development	4.75	VME	5	4.84	VME	1.5	4.69	VME	5	4.76	VME	4.5
5. Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization	4.83	VME	2	4.84	VME	1.5	4.89	VME	1	4.85	VME	1
Average Weighted Mean	**4.80**	**VME**		**4.80**	**VME**		**4.77**	**VME**		**4.79**	**VME**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Employed (VME)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Employed (ME)
2.50 – 3.49 Employed (E)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Employed (FE)
1.0 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wx – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes. An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting curriculum and instruction, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 12. The Test of Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of the Extent of the Practices Employed by the School Heads in the Implementation of the Sch

Indicators	Learning Environment	Leadership	Governance and Accountability	Human Resource and Team Development	Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization
Sum of the squared deviation from the difference (d^2)	45.50	228	304	428	162.50
Number of Groups	9	10	11	12	11
Number of Indicators	3	3	3	3	3
Coefficient of Concordance (W)	0.08	0.31	0.31	0.33	0.16
Computed Chi Square (X^2)	1.92	8.37	9.30	10.89	4.80
Degree of Freedom	8	9	10	11	10
Tabular x^2 Value with					
0.05	15.51	16.92	18.31	19.68	18.31
0.025	18.17	19.68	21.16	22.62	21.16
0.01	20.09	21.67	23.21	24.72	23.21
0.005	21.96	23.59	25.19	26.76	25.19
0.001	26.12	27.88	29.59	31.26	29.59
Decision of H_0	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance of Agreement	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on leadership and governance could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

Table 13. The Problems Encountered by the Respondents in the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in terms of Resources Needed

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R
1. Insufficient budget allocation to support SBM-related programs and activities.	3.51	MS	5	3.47	S	7	3.32	S	8	3.43	S	7
2. Limited availability of school facilities to accommodate various school improvement initiatives.	3.85	MS	1	3.42	S	8	3.57	MS	5	3.61	MS	5
3. Shortage of learning resources such as books, modules, and activity sheets.	3.81	MS	2	3.58	MS	3.5	3.89	MS	2	3.76	MS	2
4. Lack of adequate instructional materials needed for effective teaching and learning.	3.76	MS	3	3.56	MS	5.5	3.57	MS	5	3.63	MS	3
5. Difficulty in accessing external support or donations from stakeholders and partners.	3.45	S	7	3.64	MS	1	3.57	MS	5	3.55	MS	6
6. Inadequate ICT equipment and technology tools for administrative and instructional support.	3.47	S	6	3.60	MS	2	4.45	MS	1	3.84	MS	1
7. Insufficient training on proper resource management and utilization among school personnel.	3.55	MS	4	3.58	MS	3.5	3.72	MS	3	3.62	MS	4
8. Poor maintenance of existing school resources, leading to unusable materials and facilities.	3.22	S	9	2.84	S	9	3.38	S	7	3.15	S	9
9. Delayed procurement and distribution of supplies, affecting program implementation.	3.32	S	8	3.56	MS	5.5	2.89	S	9	3.26	S	8
Average Weighted Mean	**3.55**	**MS**		**3.47**	**S**		**3.60**	**MS**		**3.54**	**MS**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Serious (VMS)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Serious (MS)
2.50 – 3.49 Serious (S)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Serious (FS)
1.00 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wa – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.
The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with resource management. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.
The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.
For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of resource management would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 14. The Problems Encountered by the Respondents in The Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in terms of Administration Suppo

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R
1. Limited support from school administrators in implementing SBM activities.	2.24	FS	9	2.37	FS	7	2.55	S	2	2.39	FS	6.5
2. Insufficient administrative involvement in school improvement planning.	2.59	S	1	2.58	S	3	2.28	FS	9	2.48	FS	2
3. Weak coordination among school leaders and teachers in SBM implementation.	2.11	FS	10	2.32	FS	10	2.36	FS	7	2.23	FS	10
4. Limited decision-making support given to teachers and committees.	2.35	FS	6	2.53	S	4	2.79	S	1	2.53	S	1
5. Poor communication between administrators and stakeholders about SBM goals and activities.	2.55	S	2	2.41	FS	6	1.96	FS	10	2.31	FS	9
6. Lack of clear direction and guidance from the school head regarding SBM processes.	2.20	FS	8	2.32	FS	8	2.36	FS	5.5	2.33	FS	8
7. Delayed approval of school projects and requests, affecting timely execution.	2.50	S	3	2.44	FS	5	2.45	FS	3	2.46	FS	3.5
Inadequate monitoring and follow-up of SBM-related programs by administrators.	2.36	FS	7	2.62	S	2	2.36	FS	5.5	2.45	FS	5
9. Lack of capacity-building opportunities provided by administrators for SBM implementation.	2.49	FS	4	2.24	FS	9	2.43	FS	4	2.39	FS	6.5
10. Insufficient administrative encouragement and motivation for staff participation.	2.42	FS	5	2.64	S	1	2.32	FS	8	2.46	FS	3.5
Average Weighted Mean	**2.39**	**FS**		**2.44**	**FS**		**2.38**	**FS**		**2.40**	**FS**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Serious (VMS)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Serious (MS)
2.50 – 3.49 Serious (S)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Serious (FS)
1.00 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wa – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.
The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with stakeholder engagement. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.
The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.
For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of stakeholder engagement would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 15. The Problems Encountered by the Respondents in the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in terms of Stakeholders' Cooper

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R
1. Low participation of parents in school programs and SBM activities.	3.32	S	4	2.97	S	9	3.30	S	5	3.20	S	4
2. Insufficient awareness of stakeholders about the goals and benefits of SBM.	3.09	S	7	3.00	S	7	3.40	S	4	3.16	S	5
3. Stakeholders' lack of trust or interest in school management processes	2.68	S	10	2.99	S	8	3.11	S	7	2.93	S	9
4. Difficulty in mobilizing volunteers for school projects and activities.	3.26	S	5.5	3.02	S	6	2.85	S	10	3.04	S	7
5. Communication gaps between the school and stakeholders, causing misunderstandings.	2.46	FS	11	1.99	FS	11	2.57	S	11	2.34	FS	11
6. Limited financial or material contributions from stakeholders to support SBM implementation.	3.86	MS	1	3.45	S	3	3.49	S	3	3.60	MS	3
7. Weak commitment of stakeholders to provide assistance or resources.	3.64	MS	2	3.99	MS	1	3.53	MS	2	3.72	MS	1.5
8. Irregular attendance of stakeholders in meetings and consultations.	3.57	MS	3	3.75	MS	2	3.85	MS	1	3.72	MS	1.5
9. Lack of support from local stakeholders for school improvement initiatives.	3.04	S	9	2.64	S	10	2.91	S	9	2.86	S	10
10. Limited involvement of community members in decision-making and planning.	3.26	S	5.5	3.08	S	5	3.02	S	8	3.11	S	8
11. Poor collaboration between school and external partners	2.72	S	9	3.13	S	4	3.23	S	6	3.03	S	8
Average Weighted Mean	**3.17**	**S**		**3.09**	**S**		**3.21**	**S**		**3.16**	**S**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Serious (VMS)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Serious (MS)
2.50 – 3.49 Serious (S)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Serious (FS)
1.00 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wa – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with performance and accountability. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of performance and accountability would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 16. The Problems Encountered by the Respondents in the Implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM) Framework in terms of Inadequate Training

Indicators	Large Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R	Wa	I	R
1. Lack of sufficient training on SBM policies and implementation guidelines.	3.09	S	2	2.87	S	6.5	2.68	S	7	2.88	S	3
2. Limited orientation programs for teachers and staff regarding SBM roles and responsibilities.	2.92	S	3	2.87	S	6.5	2.34	FS	9	2.71	S	9
3. Insufficient capacity-building activities for school leaders in managing SBM processes.	2.82	S	4	2.90	S	5	2.87	S	3	2.86	S	4
4. Inadequate training on school planning and budgeting under SBM.	2.61	S	7	3.12	S	4	2.74	S	4	2.82	S	5
5. Few opportunities for professional development related to SBM practices	2.47	FS	9	3.22	S	1	2.72	S	5.5	2.80	S	6
6. Unavailability of updated training materials and modules for SBM implementation.	2.66	S	6	2.84	S	9	2.72	S	5.5	2.74	S	8
7. Lack of training on monitoring and evaluation of SBM programs and projects.	3.57	MS	1	3.21	S	2	3.15	S	1	3.31	S	1
8. Limited skills in resource mobilization and stakeholder engagement due to insufficient training.	2.50	S	8	3.20	S	3	2.60	S	8	2.77	S	7
9. Inconsistent follow-up coaching and support after trainings are conducted	2.80	S	5	2.85	S	8	3.02	S	2	2.89	S	2
Average Weighted Mean	**2.83**	**S**		**3.01**	**S**		**2.76**	**S**		**2.87**	**S**	

Legend:
4.50 – 5.00 Very Much Serious (VMS)
3.50 – 4.49 Much Serious (MS)
2.50 – 3.49 Serious (S)
1.50 – 2.49 Fairly Serious (FS)
1.00 – 1.49 Not at All (NA)

Wa – Weighted Mean
I – Interpretation
R – Rank

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework, including operational aspects associated with learning environment. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of learning environment would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

4. Discussion

Taken together, the findings suggest a differentiated profile of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework within public elementary schools in the Division of Camarines Norte. Some domains were rated more favorably than others, but the study's comparisons concerned respondents' evaluations of program activity or practice. The interpretation should therefore emphasize the organization and visibility of those practices rather than unobserved changes in educational outcomes.

The domains must also be considered conceptually. For example, curriculum and instruction and implementation problems and proposed solutions involve different operational demands even when they appear in the same questionnaire. An overall rating cannot establish that schools have equivalent capacity, resources or instructional conditions. Follow-up should identify the precise activities behind each item and test whether respondents applied a shared meaning to the measurement scale.

The study's rank-concordance analysis makes an additional contribution by examining alignment in the order assigned to indicators. Kendall's W is sensitive to patterns of ranking among the selected groups; it does not assess causation, pupil-level correlations or improvements over time. A statistically significant result should therefore be explained as concordance of ordered profiles, while nonsignificant outcomes should not be called evidence that a practice was ineffective.

The cited scholarship and policy provide context but should not be treated as validating the local mean scores. Guidance from Department of Education, 2012, Department of Education, 2020 highlights the importance of clearly specified practices, appropriate pedagogical support or relevant educational standards. Applying such guidance requires attention to local implementation, documentation and direct assessment rather than reliance on favorable response categories alone.

Implications for school administrators include establishing observable criteria for high-priority activities, checking participation and resource access across schools, and using professional conversations to determine why some dimensions received lower assessments. If the objective is to understand effects on actual teacher or learner performance, a subsequent design should add independent outcome data, repeated observations and an appropriate comparison framework.

The main limitations arise from the local scope of the respondents, reliance on reported ratings, the unequal or limited respondent groups in some analyses, and incomplete access to item-level observations for independent verification. In addition, the underlying survey cannot by itself separate the contribution of implementation problems and proposed solutions from other school, family, learner or policy influences. The conclusions therefore remain descriptive and context-specific; extension beyond the study setting requires additional evidence.

5. Conclusion

The study documented the reported status of school heads' implementation of the School-Based Management framework in public elementary schools in the Division of Camarines Norte. Its domain-level results and agreement tests offer an account of local respondent perceptions, areas of comparatively stronger implementation and aspects warranting closer attention. Reported means and statistical decisions were retained as presented, without reinterpretation as experimental effects.

The findings support evidence-informed review of curriculum and instruction, learning environment and implementation problems and proposed solutions. Implementation monitoring, clearer criteria for rating performance, and direct observational or learner-level evidence are suitable priorities for further research. The study does not demonstrate that an individual practice caused an improvement in school, teacher or learner outcomes.

References

[1] Department of Education. (2012). DO 83, s. 2012: Implementing guidelines on the revised School-Based Management (SBM) framework, assessment process and tool (APAT). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2012/11/29/do-83-s-2012-implementing-guidelines-on-the-revised-school-based-management-sbm-framework-assessment-process-and-tool-apat/

[2] Department of Education. (2020). DO 24, s. 2020: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf