

Empowering Schools for Success: School-Based Management Practices of Public Schools in Camarines Norte

Nerrisa S. Ramirez., Analyln D. Ramos

Mabini Colleges Inc

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.13010120>

Received: 19 January 2026; Accepted: 24 January 2026; Published: 07 February 2026

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the School-Based Management (SBM) practices of public elementary and secondary schools in the Division of Camarines Norte with the aim of identifying best practices and proposing a handbook intervention. Specifically, it sought to answer the following: (1) What is the Extent of understanding of the principles and practices of SBM in terms of vision and purpose, features, structures and roles, and support systems? (2) What is the extent of SBM implementation along leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources? (3) Is there a significant relationship between understanding and implementation of SBM? (4) What best practices are evident in SBM implementation? (5) What challenges are encountered by teachers and school heads? and (6) What intervention may be proposed to strengthen SBM practices? A quantitative-descriptive correlational design complemented by thematic analysis was employed, involving six school heads and forty-four teachers purposively selected from SBM implementer schools. Findings revealed that respondents demonstrated excellent understanding of SBM in terms of vision and purpose (OWM = 4.27) and structures and roles (OWM = 4.22), while features (OWM = 4.15) and support systems (OWM = 4.16) were at a good Extent. SBM implementation was rated Exemplary across all dimensions, with curriculum and learning highest (OWM = 4.15). A significant positive relationship ($p < 0.01$) was found between understanding and implementation. Best practices included collaborative leadership, contextualized curriculum, participatory accountability, and transparent resource management, while challenges included limited stakeholder participation, inadequate human resources, insufficient funding, and difficulty in securing external resources. Based on these, a School-Based Management Handbook was proposed to consolidate policies, processes, and tools for more consistent implementation

Keywords: School-Based Management, leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability, resource management, intervention

INTRODUCTION

School-Based Management (SBM) is one of the Department of Education's reform thrusts aimed at empowering schools through shared governance, localized decision-making, and accountability mechanisms (DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012; Republic Act 9155). International literature emphasizes SBM's role in decentralization, participatory governance, and improved learning outcomes (Caldwell, 2005; Patrinos, 2019; Abdullah, 2020). In the Philippines, studies affirm that SBM enhances transparency, curriculum contextualization, and school-community partnerships, but also identify persistent challenges such as limited resources, inadequate capacity-building, and uneven stakeholder involvement (De Guzman, 2006; Maca, 2019; Dulog, 2024).

In Camarines Norte, preliminary observations revealed strong awareness of SBM policies yet inconsistent practices in curriculum implementation, accountability processes, and resource mobilization. This study, therefore, assessed the Extent of understanding and extent of SBM implementation among teachers and school heads, identified best practices and challenges, and developed a proposed SBM Handbook to unify and strengthen implementation.

This study aimed to assess the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in public elementary and secondary schools in the Division of Camarines Norte. Specifically, it sought to determine the Extent of

understanding of teachers and school heads on the principles and practices of SBM in terms of vision and purpose, features, structures and roles, and support systems. It also aimed to evaluate the extent of SBM implementation along the dimensions of leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources. Furthermore, the study sought to identify whether there is a significant relationship between the respondents' understanding of SBM and the extent of its implementation. It also explored the best practices that demonstrate effective SBM application as well as the challenges encountered by teachers and school heads in carrying out SBM. Lastly, the study intended to propose an intervention in the form of a School-Based Management Handbook to strengthen consistency, enhance stakeholder participation, and sustain continuous improvement in SBM practices.

School-Based Management (SBM) is anchored on the theory of decentralization and shared governance, which holds that transferring selected decision-making functions closer to the school level can improve responsiveness to learner needs when authority is matched with capacity, resources, and accountability mechanisms. In this lens, effective SBM is expected to be reflected in (a) participatory leadership and stakeholder engagement, (b) localized and learner-centered curriculum implementation, (c) transparent accountability and continuous improvement cycles, and (d) strategic resource mobilization and management. Accordingly, this study interprets SBM practices in Camarines Norte not only as policy compliance, but as governance processes shaped by the interaction of local autonomy, stakeholder participation, and enabling support systems.

Within this context, the present study is delimited as follows:

This study is limited to examining School-Based Management (SBM) practices in selected public schools in the Division of Camarines Norte during School Year 2024–2025. It focuses on stakeholders' reported understanding, extent of implementation, perceived best practices, and encountered challenges across the four SBM dimensions: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Management of Resources. Respondents were composed of public school teachers and school heads from SBM implementer schools covered by the study. Findings are intended to describe and synthesize SBM practices within this specific local context.

METHODS

This study employed a mixed method, a quantitative research approach using a descriptive-correlational design and qualitative approach. The descriptive aspect focused on assessing the respondents' understanding of School-Based Management (SBM) principles and the extent of SBM implementation along leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and resource management. The correlational aspect examined the relationship between respondents' Extent of understanding and the extent of SBM implementation. The qualitative method explore the best practices and challenges encountered by the respondents. This design was chosen because it allows for systematic and objective assessment of naturally occurring practices without manipulating variables, while also determining possible associations between understanding and practice. The quantitative approach further enabled the use of statistical tools to ensure accuracy and generalizability of findings.

The population of this study consisted of teachers and school heads from public elementary and secondary schools in the Division of Camarines Norte during the School Year 2024–2025. A total of six (6) school heads and forty-four (44) teachers, or fifty (50) respondents overall, were selected through purposive sampling. This method was appropriate as it targeted individuals directly engaged in SBM implementation and capable of providing reliable data on the study variables. Inclusion criteria for participation included: (1) teachers or school heads serving in SBM-recognized implementer schools, (2) active involvement in planning, governance, or accountability mechanisms such as SIP and AIP preparation, (3) representation from both elementary and secondary Extents, and (4) a minimum of three years of service within their respective schools. This ensured a sample with adequate experience and exposure to SBM processes.

Prior to data collection, formal approval was secured from the Schools Division Office of Camarines Norte and permission was obtained from the participating schools. Respondents were provided with informed consent forms detailing the objectives of the study, their voluntary participation, and their right to withdraw at any time.

Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly observed, with data collected used solely for academic purposes. A structured and validated survey questionnaire served as the primary research instrument. The questionnaire consisted of four main sections: demographic profile, understanding of SBM principles, extent of SBM implementation, and open-ended questions on best practices and challenges. The instrument underwent expert validation and was pilot-tested among teachers outside the sample to ensure clarity and reliability. Cronbach’s alpha was computed to measure internal consistency, and adjustments were made accordingly. Surveys were distributed in printed form with the researcher available for clarifications when needed.

Data were processed and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics software and NVivo. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, and weighted mean were employed to summarize the respondents’ understanding of SBM and the extent of implementation across dimensions. Somers’ Delta was applied to test the relationship between respondents’ Extent of understanding and their reported extent of SBM implementation. Thematic analysis was used for qualitative responses to identify patterns of best practices and challenges. The Extent of significance for statistical tests was set at $p < 0.05$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Extent of Understanding of the Principles and Practices of School-Based Management in terms of Vision and Purpose. Table 1 indicates a very high extent of understanding of SBM in terms of vision and purpose, with an overall weighted mean of 4.27 (Strongly Agree). Respondents most strongly affirmed SBM’s capacity to create a focused and relevant educational experience, while comparatively lower agreement was observed in confidently explaining SBM’s purpose to stakeholders (4.14, Agree)

Table 1. Extent of Understanding and Management of the Principles and Practices of School-Based Management in terms of Vision and Purpose

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Can clearly articulate a shared vision for the school that aligns with the community's needs.	4.22	SA
2. Understand how SBM principles can be used to develop a school mission statement focused on student achievement.	4.28	SA
3. Confident in the ability to explain the purpose of SBM to stakeholders and how it contributes to a shared vision.	4.14	A
4. The school leader/ teacher can identify strategies to involve stakeholders in shaping the school’s vision and purpose through SBM practices.	4.28	SA
5. Believe that SBM empowers schools to create a more focused and relevant educational experience for students.	4.44	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.27	SA

Rating Scale

4.21 – 5.00	<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>
3.41 – 4.20	<i>Agree (A)</i>
2.61 – 3.40	<i>Somewhat Agree (SWA)</i>
1.81 – 2.60	<i>Disagree (DA)</i>
1.0 – 1.80	<i>Strongly Disagree (SDA)</i>

Extent of Understanding of the Principles and Practices of School-Based Management in terms of Features. As shown in Table 2, respondents demonstrated high understanding of SBM features (overall weighted mean = 4.15, Agree), particularly regarding stakeholder involvement (4.30, Strongly Agree). The lowest rating was on identifying key areas of resource management such as budgeting and personnel allocation (4.00, Agree), suggesting this is the most comparatively constrained feature-area

Table 2. Extent of understanding and Management of the Principles and Practices of School-Based Management in terms of Features

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Can explain the concept of decentralization of decision-making authority to individual schools in an SBM system.	4.04	A
2. Familiar with the different stakeholders involved in SBM such as school leaders, teachers, parents, and the community.	4.30	SA
3. Understand how SBM empowers schools to develop their own curriculum and instructional strategies based on students' needs.	4.18	A
4. Can identify key areas of resource management within SBM, such as budgeting and allocation of personnel.	4.00	A
5. Aware of the importance of accountability for improved student learning outcomes in SBM.	4.22	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.15	A

Rating Scale

4.21 – 5.00	<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>
3.41 – 4.20	<i>Agree (A)</i>
2.61 – 3.40	<i>Somewhat Agree (SWA)</i>
1.81 – 2.60	<i>Disagree (DA)</i>
1.0 – 1.80	<i>Strongly Disagree (SDA)</i>

Extent of Understanding and Management of the Principles and Practices of School-Based Management in terms of Structures and Roles. Table 3 reflects strong understanding of SBM structures and roles, with an overall weighted mean of 4.22 (Strongly Agree). High ratings were observed for understanding leadership roles (4.32, Strongly Agree), while relatively lower ratings appeared in familiarity with support structures such as the SGC and PTA (4.10, Agree) and explaining how structures enable stakeholder participation (4.14, Agree).

Table 3. Extent of Understanding and Management of the Principles and Practices of School-Based Management in terms of Structures and Roles

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Can identify the key stakeholders involved in SBM decision-making (e.g., principals, teachers, parents).	4.30	SA

2. Understand the roles and responsibilities of the school leadership team in implementing SBM practices.	4.32	SA
3. Familiar with the typical structures found in schools that support SBM such as SGC, PTA, and other stakeholders.	4.10	A
4. Can explain how SBM structures empower stakeholders to participate in school decision-making.	4.14	A
5. Confident in identifying the lines of authority and accountability within an SBM framework.	4.22	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.22	SA

Rating Scale

4.21 – 5.00	<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>
3.41 – 4.20	<i>Agree (A)</i>
2.61 – 3.40	<i>Somewhat Agree (SWA)</i>
1.81 – 2.60	<i>Disagree (DA)</i>
1.0 – 1.80	<i>Strongly Disagree (SDA)</i>

Extent of Understanding and Management of the Principles and Practices of School-Based Management in terms of Support System. Table 4 shows generally positive perceptions of SBM support systems (overall weighted mean = 4.16, Agree), particularly access to technical assistance and a collaborative culture (both 4.22, Strongly Agree). The comparatively lowest rating was on the adequacy of funding and resources (4.00, Agree), indicating resource support remains the most constrained area

Table 4. Extent of Understanding and Management of the Principles and Practices of School-Based Management in terms of Support System

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. The school administration provides clear information and resources on SBM processes and procedures.	4.20	A
2. Comfortable accessing technical assistance from the district or division office regarding SBM implementation.	4.22	SA
3. There are opportunities for ongoing professional development on effective SBM practices for staff and leadership.	4.18	A
4. The school receives adequate funding and resources to support SBM initiatives.	4.00	A
5. There is a collaborative culture within the school that encourages participation in SBM decision-making	4.22	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.16	A

Rating Scale

4.21 – 5.00	<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>
3.41 – 4.20	<i>Agree (A)</i>
2.61 – 3.40	<i>Somewhat Agree (SWA)</i>
1.81 – 2.60	<i>Disagree (DA)</i>
1.0 – 1.80	<i>Strongly Disagree (SDA)</i>

Across Tables 1–4, the consistently high understanding supports the decentralization and shared governance premise that SBM effectiveness depends on stakeholders’ conceptual clarity about roles, processes, and support mechanisms. However, the comparatively lower ratings on resource-related and support-system items suggest a capacity gap, where understanding is strong in principle but is constrained by the practical availability of enabling inputs (e.g., funding, technical assistance). This implies that strengthening SBM requires not only awareness of the framework but also system supports that translate understanding into routine practice.

Extent of Practice of School-Based Management Implementation in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools along with Leadership and Governance. Table 5 indicates that SBM implementation in Leadership and Governance is Exemplary, with an overall weighted mean of 4.11 (Exemplary). The highest-rated indicator is the mechanism for developing a shared VMG reflecting community aspirations (4.24, Outstanding), while the lowest pertains to community facilitation of the education plan (3.92, Exemplary).

Table 5. Extent of Practice of School-Based Management Implementation in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools along with Leadership and Governance

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. There is in place a mechanism that allows for the development of a shared vision, mission, and goals (VMG) which reflects the aspirations and thrusts of the community.	4.24	Outstanding
2. The organization’s vision, direction, and aspirations are periodically revisited and adjusted by the learning managers, learning facilitators, and community stakeholders to respond to the community’s conditions and emerging needs.	4.20	Exemplary
3. Stakeholders actively participate, through dialogue and/or consensus-building, in formulating relevant policies and guidelines in conducting regular reviews and updating of community initiatives.	4.16	Exemplary
4. The organizational structure for education governance promotes ownership of goals and members assume particular roles and responsibilities to carry out initiatives.	4.14	Exemplary
5. The community facilitates the development of an education plan based on its vision, direction, and aspirations.	3.92	Exemplary
6. The governance practices facilitate regular information and feedback sharing on the progress of the education development program.	4.00	Exemplary

7. Decisions are consistently based on valued and respected information sources and processes that adhere to the vision, direction, and aspirations of the community.	4.10	Exemplary
Overall Weighted Mean	4.11	Exemplary

Rating Scale

4.21 – 5.0	<i>Outstanding</i>
3.41 – 4.20	<i>Exemplary</i>
2.61 – 3.40	<i>Advanced</i>
1.81 – 2.60	<i>Developing</i>
1.0 – 1.80	<i>Basic</i>

Extent of Practice of School-Based Management Implementation in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools along with Curriculum and Learning. Table 6 shows that SBM implementation in Curriculum and Learning is Exemplary, with an overall weighted mean of 4.15 (Exemplary). The highest mean supports an inclusive and contextualized curriculum responsive to community and learner needs (4.28, Outstanding), whereas the lowest reflects limited community participation in mentoring learners and promoting citizenship (3.94, Exemplary).

Table 6. Extent of Practice of School-Based Management Implementation in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools along with Curriculum and Learning

Indicators	WM	Description
1. The implemented curriculum is rights-based, inclusive, culturally and developmentally appropriate to the needs and interests of the learners and community, localized for relevance to the community life, consistent with the vision, mission, and goals, and oriented towards individual and community well-being.	4.28	Outstanding
2. The learning systems are regularly and collaboratively monitored by the community using appropriate tools to ensure the holistic growth and development of the learners and the community.	4.02	Exemplary
3. Appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved, and assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situation, and the attainment of relevant life skills.	4.12	Exemplary
4. The community actively participates in developing and mentoring the learners' awareness and practice of good citizenship and shares in the attainment of individual and collective competencies.	3.94	Exemplary
5. Methods and resources are learner and community-friendly, enjoyable, safe, inclusive, accessible, and aimed at developing self-directed learners.	4.22	Outstanding
6. Learning environment, methods, and resources are accessible and promote effective learning and are appropriate to the learners' ecology, history, community worldview, values, and spirituality.	4.16	Exemplary
7. Learning managers and facilitators (teachers, administrators, and community members) nurture values and environments that are protective of all children, inclusive	4.24	Outstanding

of all children, and demonstrate behaviors consistent with the organization’s vision, mission, and goals.		
8. Learners are equipped with essential understanding, skills, and values to assume responsibility and accountability for their learning.	4.22	Outstanding
Overall Weighted Mean	4.15	Exemplary

Rating Scale

4.21 – 5.0	<i>Outstanding</i>
3.41 – 4.20	<i>Exemplary</i>
2.61 – 3.40	<i>Advanced</i>
1.81 – 2.60	<i>Developing</i>
1.0 – 1.80	<i>Basic</i>

Extent of Practice of School-Based Management Implementation in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools along with Accountability and Continuous Improvement. Table 7 reflects Exemplary SBM implementation in Accountability and Continuous Improvement, with an overall weighted mean of 4.08 (Exemplary). The highest rating is recognizing goal achievement through a collaboratively developed performance accountability system (4.10, Exemplary), while the lowest concerns clearly defined stakeholder roles and responsibilities (4.04, Exemplary).

Table 7. Extent of Practice of School-Based Management Implementation in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools along with Accountability and Continuous Improvement

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Roles and responsibilities of accountable person/s and collective body/ies are clearly defined and agreed upon by community stakeholders.	4.04	Exemplary
2. Achievement of goals is recognized based on a collaboratively developed performance accountability system; gaps are addressed through appropriate action.	4.10	Exemplary
3. The accountability system that is owned by the community is continuously enhanced to ensure that management structures and mechanisms are responsive to the emerging learning needs and demands of the community.	4.08	Exemplary
4. Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon. (PROCESS)	4.08	Exemplary
5. Participatory assessment of performance is done regularly with the community. Assessment results and lessons learned serve as the basis for feedback, technical assistance, recognition, and plan adjustment.	4.08	Exemplary
Overall Weighted Mean	4.08	Exemplary

Rating Scale

4.21 – 5.0	<i>Outstanding</i>
3.41 – 4.20	<i>Exemplary</i>
2.61 – 3.40	<i>Advanced</i>
1.81 – 2.60	<i>Developing</i>
1.0 – 1.80	<i>Basic</i>

Extent of Practice of School-Based Management Implementation in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools along with Management of Resources. Table 8 indicates Exemplary SBM implementation in Management of Resources, with an overall weighted mean of 4.05 (Exemplary). The highest mean highlights collaboratively conducted resource inventory for allocation and mobilization (4.12, Exemplary), while the lowest relates to community-developed resource management systems and joint M&E implementation (4.02, Exemplary).

Table 8. Extent of Practice of School-Based Management Implementation in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools along with Management of Resources

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Regular resource inventory is collaboratively undertaken by learning managers, learning facilitators, and community stakeholders as the basis for resource allocation and mobilization	4.12	Exemplary
2. There is a regular dialogue for planning and resource programming, that is accessible and inclusive, to continuously engage stakeholders and support the implementation of community education plans	4.04	Exemplary
3. There is in place a community-developed resource management system that drives appropriate behaviors of the stakeholders to ensure judicious, appropriate, and effective use of resources.	4.02	Exemplary
4. Regular monitoring, evaluation, and reporting processes of resource management are collaboratively developed and jointly implemented by the learning managers, facilitators, and community stakeholders.	4.02	Exemplary
5. There is a system that manages the network and linkages that strengthen and sustain partnerships for improving resource management.	4.04	Exemplary
Overall Weighted Mean	4.05	Exemplary

Rating Scale

4.21 – 5.0	<i>Outstanding</i>
3.41 – 4.20	<i>Exemplary</i>
2.61 – 3.40	<i>Advanced</i>
1.81 – 2.60	<i>Developing</i>
1.0 – 1.80	<i>Basic</i>

The exemplary implementation levels across the four SBM dimensions indicate that key governance routines—participatory leadership, contextualized curriculum processes, accountability practices, and resource management are generally institutionalized at the school level. From a shared governance lens, these results suggest that schools are able to operationalize local autonomy when structures for participation and planning are in place. Still, relatively lower indicators that involve deeper community facilitation and co-managed systems imply that participation may be stronger in consultation than in sustained co-implementation.

Relationship Between the Extent of Understanding and Extent of SBM Implementation. Table 9 shows a statistically significant positive association between SBM understanding and SBM implementation across all domains (p-values 0.000–0.007, significant at $p < 0.01$), indicating that higher understanding corresponds to stronger implementation. The Support System dimension demonstrates the strongest links to implementation across the four SBM domains (Somers’ d up to 0.650, $p = 0.000$).

Table 9. Relationship Between the Extent of Understanding and Extent of SBM Implementation

Understanding of SBM	SBM Implementation Principles							
	Leadership and Governance		Curriculum and Learning		Accountability and Continuous Improvement		Management of Resources	
	Somer’s d	p-value	Somer’s d	p-value	Somer’s d	p-value	Somer’s d	p-value
Vision and Purpose	0.507	0.000	0.388	0.001	0.478	0.000	0.415	0.000
Features	0.449	0.000	0.398	0.000	0.419	0.000	0.351	0.007
Structures and Roles	0.538	0.000	0.457	0.000	0.462	0.000	0.468	0.000
Support System	0.650	0.000	0.558	0.000	0.582	0.000	0.513	0.000

Significant at $p < 0.01$

The significant positive association between SBM understanding and SBM implementation aligns with a capacity-driven decentralization view: implementation improves when stakeholders possess clearer procedural knowledge and shared interpretation of SBM requirements. The stronger links involving the support system dimension further suggest that autonomy alone is insufficient; implementation is most likely to improve when schools have enabling mechanisms such as technical assistance, training, and resourcing pathways. Thus, building shared understanding and strengthening support structures are complementary levers for improving SBM performance.

Best Practices Are Manifested In The Implementation of SBM in terms of Leadership And Governance in terms of Leadership And Governance. Table 10 highlights leadership and governance best practices anchored on participatory and values-driven governance, reflected in four coherent leadership patterns: collaborative/transformational leadership, inclusive stakeholder engagement, participatory and transparent SBM leadership, and VMG alignment through stakeholder-driven planning.

Table 10. Best Practices Are Manifested In The Implementation of SBM in terms of Leadership And Governancemet.

Theme	Sub-theme	Sample Responses
Collaborative and	Empowerment of teachers and stakeholders	“I practice transformational leadership style to encourage teamwork, open communication, shared decision-making, and innovation.” – T5

Transformational Leadership	<p>Open communication</p> <p>Shared decision-making</p> <p>Teamwork and cooperation</p> <p>Decentralized leadership</p> <p>Stakeholder involvement</p>	<p>“Each grade Extent was given tasks, and every grade Extent helps in SBM implementation.” – T1</p> <p>“Strong partnership with community stakeholders as transformational leader.” – P1</p>
Inclusive and Transparent Stakeholder Engagement	<p>Shared governance and transparency</p> <p>Regular meetings and dialogues</p> <p>Open communication</p> <p>Parental participation</p> <p>Collaborative decision-making</p>	<p>“Shared governance, strengthened trust and transparency.” – P1</p> <p>“By conducting FGDs, forums, conferences, and open meetings.” – T4</p> <p>“Open communication between parents, stakeholders, and teachers is an effective strategy in school decision-making.” – T6</p>
Leadership for Participatory and Transparent SBM Implementation	<p>Collaborative decision-making</p> <p>Transparency in fund/resource use</p> <p>Stakeholder orientation and engagement</p> <p>Delegation of roles and documentation</p> <p>Consistency and capacity-building</p>	<p>“Collaborative decision-making, stakeholder engagement, transparency.” – P1</p> <p>“Promoting transparency in MOOE.” – T1</p> <p>“Updated and intact documentation of programs and activities.” – T4</p>

The findings suggest that SBM has supported schools in making instruction more relevant and participatory.

Best Practices Are Manifested In The Implementation of SBM in terms of Leadership And Governance in terms of Curriculum And Learning

Table 11 identifies accountability and continuous improvement practices centered on data-driven assessment, stakeholder-engaged monitoring, structured feedback, and transparent reporting. These findings confirm that schools use assessment tools, student performance data, and participatory reviews to inform decisions. Overall, these practices show that accountability under SBM is collaborative and evidence-based.

Table 11. Best Practices Are Manifested In The Implementation of SBM in terms of Curriculum And Learning

Theme	Sub-theme	Sample Responses
Contextualized and Learner-Centered Curriculum Implementation	<p>Child-centered curriculum</p> <p>Teacher professional development</p> <p>Data-informed curriculum design</p> <p>Curriculum-aligned projects and initiatives</p> <p>Stakeholder and learner feedback</p> <p>Varied assessment strategies</p>	<p>“Sending teachers to professional development programs and using student’s data to identify the needs of the learner.” – P1</p> <p>“Initiatives such as Daang Alpabeto, Impok Ko, Baon Ko aligned with reading and numeracy.” – P3</p> <p>“Regularly conducts surveys and focus group discussions with students, parents, and community leaders.” – T5</p>

Professional Support and Contextualized Instructional Empowerment	Provision of trainings and INSET Contextualized curriculum Integration of cultural content Supportive school environment Empowering teachers' strengths Participation in DepEd initiatives	“Providing teachers with resources needed for teaching and sending to relevant trainings.” – P1 “Through integration of culturally relevant content.” – T4 “Teachers are provided with contextualized curriculum tailored to their students’ unique needs and experiences.” – T6
Innovative and Collaborative Teaching Integration	ICT/technology use Collaborative and experiential learning Critical thinking projects LAC sessions and teacher empowerment Student-centered strategies Stakeholder-supported programs	“ICT/Technology Integration.” – P1 “Implements collaborative learning games and experiential learning.” – T1 “Promotes collaboration and teacher empowerment to boost enthusiasm for teaching.” – T5

Best Practices Are Manifested In The Implementation of SBM in terms of Accountability And Continuous Improvement Table 12 highlights themes in SBM resource management: strategic and transparent allocation, collaborative mobilization, institutionalized fiscal governance, and innovative community partnerships. Schools reported practices such as collaborative budgeting, COA-compliant systems, and transparency boards. These findings demonstrate that schools are practicing responsible fiscal governance. Continued support in financial management and resource mobilization is needed to maximize SBM’s promise of shared accountability.

Table 12. Best Practices Are Manifested In The Implementation of SBM in terms of Accountability And Continuous Improvement

Theme	Sub-theme	Sample Responses
Data-Driven Assessment and Stakeholder-Engaged Monitoring	SBM self-assessment tools Performance data analysis Stakeholder feedback Monitoring and evaluation sheets Use of qualitative and quantitative methods Validation-based updates	“Regular SBM assessment with participation of stakeholders using the self-assessment checklist.” – P1 “Self-assessment tool and stakeholder feedback mechanism, school performance data analysis...” – P3 “Through continuous SBM practices and by applying or modifying suggested comments during validation.” – T4
Data-Informed Instructional Planning and Intervention	Learning gap identification and remediation Use of assessment tools and classroom observations	“Test results of learners are being collected and analyzed to identify unmastered skills then provide appropriate remediation.” – P3 “Using assessment result in the conduct of needed interventions.” – P1

	Budget/resource allocation based on data Collaborative planning through LAC School-Extent initiatives for learning recovery	“Student data revealed low scores, prompting the creation of Project NUMBO to enhance teaching and learning.” – T4
Structured Stakeholder Feedback and Participatory Decision-Making	SIP reviews with stakeholders Regular meetings and FGDs Feedback forms and suggestion boxes School charter systems SPT and SPTA consultations Collaborative communication mechanisms	“SIP review and adjustment every SY with SPT.” – P1 “We conducted regular meetings and FGD to analyze, plan and act.” – P3 “Through FGDs, conferences, and SPTA meetings.” – T4

Best Practices Are Manifested In The Implementation of SBM in terms of Management of Resources. Table 13 reveals that school heads identified challenges such as limited stakeholder participation, lack of professional development, and time constraints. These concerns suggest that while structures exist, the depth of engagement and leadership capacity still needs strengthening. These results imply that SBM’s leadership and governance dimensions remain strong in principle but face practical challenges.

Table 13. Best Practices Are Manifested In The Implementation of SBM in terms of Management of Resources

Theme	Sub-theme	Sample Responses
Strategic and Transparent Resource Management	Use of SIP, AIP, and WFP Needs assessment Stakeholder-involved budgeting Compliance with COA and procurement guidelines Fund sourcing and prioritization meetings	“Needs assessment, preparation of WFP.” – P1 “Our school is aligning and utilizing all financial resources through SIP, APP, and COA circular.” – P3 “Through SIP (School Improvement Plan) and AIP (Annual Implementation Plan).” – T1
Strategic and Collaborative Resource Mobilization for Goal Attainment	Alignment of PPAs and SIP Stakeholder-funded projects Use of MOOE Strategic and concrete planning Allocation based on needs and pupil data Physical and instructional material support	“Effective resource management by prioritizing needs and aligning PPAs and SIP.” – P1 “Project funded by stakeholders are the best example because it proves that they are willingly cooperating in school plans and goals.” – P3 “MOOE is utilized effectively with collaboration from school stakeholders.” – T5
Institutionalized Transparency and Participatory Fiscal Governance	Transparency boards Public reporting during assemblies	“Transparency board, regular meeting in the quarterly PIRPA, and reporting in the stakeholder’s assembly.” – P1

	<p>Dissemination of Annual Procurement Plans Use of PIRPA and financial forums</p> <p>Open communication with stakeholders</p>	<p>“Annual procurement plan is furnished to stakeholders and posted on the transparency board.” – P3</p> <p>“Announcements during PTA and SOC meetings; use of transparency board and online platforms.” – T6</p>
--	--	---

Challenges in School-Based Management of Teachers in terms of Leadership and Governance. Table 14 indicates that the challenges in SBM implementation in terms of leadership and governance revolve around concentrated decision-making, limited stakeholder participation, time and workload pressures, and gaps in SBM-focused professional development and cascading. These findings reflect ongoing gaps in support for curriculum delivery. The results suggest that while schools recognize the value of contextualized curriculum, challenges in resources and training hinder full implementation. Addressing these concerns requires consistent investment in professional development and stronger collaboration with community partners.

Table 14. Challenges in School-Based Management of Teachers in terms of Leadership and Governance

Theme	Sub-theme	Sample Responses
Concentrated Decision-Making Amid Intended Shared Governance	<p>Decisions initiated and finalized by a small core group</p> <p>Limited opportunity for wider input</p> <p>SBM consultation done at the tail-end of planning</p>	<p>“Many decisions are still initiated and finalized by a small core group... Teachers are consulted, but often when plans are already almost complete.” – T1</p> <p>“Decision-making is still centered on a few key people... stakeholders are usually consulted when plans are almost finalized.” – T2</p>
Limited and Uneven Stakeholder Participation	<p>Scheduling constraints for parents and community · Passive participation and quiet meetings</p> <p>Limited learner voice in formal settings</p> <p>Participation confined to a small active group</p>	<p>“Parents and community members are usually working during our meeting times... their participation becomes more symbolic than substantive.” – T1</p> <p>“Only a core group of parents and barangay officials are consistently involved in decision-making.” – P3</p> <p>“We usually end up with a limited set of very active stakeholders, while others remain passive.” – P1</p>
Time and Workload Pressures on School Leaders	<p>School heads juggling multiple roles</p> <p>Difficulty convening stakeholders regularly</p> <p>SBMs tasks competing with reports, exams, and events</p>	<p>“SBM-related trainings... often coincide with reporting periods and senior high school activities.” – P1</p> <p>“In a large school, coordination is a major challenge... ensuring that everyone understands and owns the SBM direction requires intensive communication and constant follow-up.” – P2</p> <p>“I handle multiple roles, and convening all stakeholders regularly is not easy because of distance and terrain.” – P3</p>

Challenges in School-Based Management of Teachers in terms of Curriculum and Learning. Table 15 shows that curriculum and learning challenges are shaped by constraints in resources, training follow-through,

localization support, and formative monitoring and feedback. These findings imply that even when SBM processes are present, instructional improvement becomes uneven when schools lack adequate materials and sustained coaching structures that enable teachers to contextualize instruction and respond to learner diversity. Overall, the results suggest that while SBM promotes contextualized learning, teachers face persistent challenges in resources, training, and monitoring. These challenges imply that greater investment in professional development and stronger support systems are necessary to ensure that SBM-driven curriculum reforms translate into improved learning outcomes.

Table 15. Challenges in School-Based Management of Teachers in terms of Curriculum and Learning

Theme	Sub-theme	Sample Responses
Limited Resources for Contextualized and Differentiated Instruction	<p>Insufficient contextualized materials</p> <p>Limited remedial/enrichment programs</p> <p>Constraints from large classes and shared facilities</p> <p>Inadequate support materials for highland/urban realities</p>	<p>“We lack enough contextualized materials suited to their backgrounds... interventions and enrichment activities are constrained by resources, time, and large class sizes.” – T1</p> <p>“We want to adapt lessons and remediation to these realities, but we lack enough contextualized materials, reading resources, and time.” – T2</p> <p>“We lack sufficient contextualized materials and catch-up programs that fit the community’s livelihood cycles.” – P3</p>
Insufficient Sustained Training and Coaching on Innovative Strategies	<p>Infrequent or lecture-type trainings</p> <p>Limited hands-on demonstrations</p> <p>Lack of classroom-based coaching and follow-through</p> <p>Difficulty sustaining learner-centered approaches</p>	<p>“Trainings... are not as frequent as we need, and when they happen, they are usually lecture-type... we are left to experiment on our own without consistent coaching.” – T1</p> <p>“Most seminars are generic... without specific examples that consider our class sizes and situation, it is hard for teachers to confidently shift their practices.” – P3</p> <p>“Teachers are oriented on learner-centered strategies, but large class sizes and limited classroom space make it hard to apply them.” – T4</p>
Challenges in Aligning Curriculum with Local Context and Learner Realities	<p>Tension between MELCs and localization</p> <p>Textbooks not reflecting local culture, poverty, or urban issues</p> <p>Individual, uncoordinated localization efforts</p>	<p>“We have to exert extra effort to localize lessons... we are unsure if all our localized activities remain fully aligned with MELCs.” – T1</p> <p>“Textbooks rarely reflect [our] local culture and agricultural practices... we prepare localized materials individually and after class hours.” – T2</p> <p>“Urban issues like congestion, safety, and diverse cultures are sometimes not adequately reflected in textbooks and modules.” – P4</p>

Challenges in School-Based Management of Teachers in terms of Accountability and Continuous Improvement. Table 16 reveals that accountability and continuous improvement challenges are characterized by fragmented and labor-intensive data management, limited capacity for data analysis and planning use,

difficulty making reports understandable and engaging, and hesitancy toward new improvement tools and processes. These themes indicate that accountability under SBM can become difficult to sustain when evidence systems are not integrated and when reporting becomes compliance-heavy rather than improvement-centered. Overall, the results suggest that while transparency is generally practiced, accountability under SBM remains constrained by stakeholder resistance and technical limitations in data management. Addressing these gaps requires continued orientation for stakeholders and provision of tools that will strengthen evidence-based decision-making.

Table 16. Challenges in School-Based Management of Teachers in terms of Accountability and Continuous Improvement

Theme	Sub-theme	Sample Responses
Fragmented and Labor-Intensive Data Management	Multiple, overlapping templates and tools	“We collect a lot of data... but consolidating and analyzing them is difficult.” – T1
	Separate files per committee/program	“Different committees hold their own spreadsheets and forms... integrating these data sets... requires a lot of time.” – T3
	Manual or semi-manual consolidation	“Our tracking tools are mostly paper-based logs and simple spreadsheets... generating consolidated reports is laborious and prone to delay.” – P3
	Double encoding and delays	
Limited Capacity for Data Analysis and Use in Planning	Teachers’ and coordinators’ limited skills in data analysis	“Many teachers are not very confident in data analysis... sometimes data are submitted just to comply, without being fully interpreted.” – T1
	Data summarized only as totals/percentages	“Not all teachers are confident in data analysis... we often rely on simple percentages.” – T2 / P3
	Submission “for compliance” instead of for decision-making	“Not all committees have strong data management skills, so some analysis remains basic.” – P2
Difficulty Making Accountability Reports Understandable and Engaging	Reports technically available but hard to understand	“Reports are shared and posted, but the technical terms and tables can be hard to understand... stakeholders see the numbers but do not grasp their implications.” – T1
	Stakeholders overwhelmed by graphs and indicators	
	Limited attendance and time during assemblies	“Reports are presented and posted... but parents see figures and graphs and do not always understand what these mean.” – T2
	Misinterpretation of negative trends	“Some misinterpret negative trends as immediate failure rather than signals for improvement.” – P4

Challenges in School-Based Management of Teachers in terms of Management of Resources. Table 17 shows that resource-related challenges are centered on insufficient and stretched financial resources, limited and overloaded human resources, barriers in mobilizing external support and partnerships, and transparency efforts limited by technicality and low participation. These themes emphasize that SBM plans and improvement initiatives may be difficult to carry out when funds are prioritized for basic operations and when teachers and school heads absorb multiple documentation and program roles alongside core instructional and leadership work. These highlight the need for improved manpower distribution and stronger financial planning. Overall, the results suggest that resource management challenges in SBM are largely financial and structural, with

transparency systems relatively well established. This underscores the need for stronger financial support and enhanced planning capacities to sustain SBM practices.

Table 17. Challenges in School-Based Management of Teachers in terms of Management of Resources

Theme	Sub-theme	Sample Responses
Insufficient and Stretched Financial Resources	MOOE prioritized for utilities, repairs, basic operations	“Our MOOE has to cover many basic needs like utilities and repairs, leaving limited funds for new instructional materials and innovations.” – T1
	Limited remaining funds for innovations, ICT, and enrichment	“Our MOOE is small... only a little is left for new instructional materials or projects.” – T2
	Small budgets in rural/highland schools	“After [urban] expenses, there is limited budget left for innovation, ICT upgrades, or comprehensive reading programs.” – P4
	Higher operating costs in urban schools	
Limited and Overloaded Human Resources	Just enough teaching items, but heavy committee loads	“We are just enough in terms of teaching items, so teachers handle multiple committees and documentation work aside from teaching.” – T1
	Shortage of non-teaching staff	“Each one also handles several committees and outreach activities... we lack permanent non-teaching staff.” – P3
	Teachers handling clerical and SBM documentation work	“Class sizes are large, and many teachers also serve as coordinators or advisers... non-teaching staff are not enough for the paperwork.” – T3 / P2
	Large class sizes in bigger schools	
Barriers in Mobilizing External Support and Partnerships	Competition among schools for donors	“There is competition among schools in the division for external support... our proposals are not always approved, or support comes late.” – T1
	Geographic inaccessibility of highland schools	“External support is hard to secure because some partners hesitate to commit to highland schools due to logistics.” – P3
	Partners preferring visible/short-term projects	“Some partners prefer one-time events like donation drives... sustaining long-term partnerships that support instructional improvement is more difficult.” – P4
	Limited long-term support for instructional initiatives	

The challenges reported across governance, curriculum, accountability, and resources reflect common constraints in decentralization reforms, where responsibilities expand faster than capacity and available inputs. Resource shortages, workload pressures, fragmented reporting demands, and uneven stakeholder participation can shift SBM toward compliance-oriented routines rather than genuine collaborative problem-solving. These findings indicate that sustaining SBM quality requires strengthening enabling conditions particularly staffing, resourcing, capacity-building, and integrated systems for monitoring and reporting so that shared governance can be practiced consistently.

Proposed Intervention to Improve the Implementation of SBM in the Division of Camarines Norte

To address the gaps and challenges identified in the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM), the researcher proposes the development of an SBM Handbook for Public Schools in the Division of Camarines Norte. This intervention is justified by two key considerations: (1) the study revealed recurring inconsistencies

in stakeholder participation, resource management, curriculum contextualization, and accountability practices; and (2) existing DepEd issuances (e.g., DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012 and Regional Memorandum No. 010, s. 2023) underscore the need to strengthen participatory mechanisms, standardize procedures, and sustain continuous improvement in SBM.

The proposed handbook will function as a practical, user-friendly reference and working manual for school heads, teachers, SBM coordinators, and community stakeholders. It will consolidate essential policies, core procedures, and ready-to-use tools into a single resource to support more consistent implementation across schools. The handbook will include clear role descriptions for key stakeholders; templates and checklists for SIP, AIP, WFP, and transparency reporting; an annual implementation calendar; sample best practices from SBM implementer schools; and monitoring and evaluation forms to document progress and guide feedback.

The handbook is intended for school leaders, teachers, and stakeholders directly involved in SBM processes, who may use it to support participatory planning, budgeting, resource mobilization, and accountability reporting. By providing standardized formats and contextualized examples, the handbook reduces reliance on fragmented guidelines and promotes clearer, more aligned implementation at the school level.

The handbook was developed by synthesizing the study findings with observed best practices in SBM implementer schools and aligning these with national and regional directives. Institutionalizing its use is expected to strengthen stakeholder engagement, promote transparency, standardize resource management processes, and reinforce continuous improvement—thereby helping ensure that SBM implementation in Camarines Norte remains effective, inclusive, and responsive to learner and community needs.

To support adoption, the researcher also prepared a dissemination plan to communicate the study results and operationalize the handbook across schools. This includes targeted orientations and capacity-building activities integrated into INSET and Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions in selected public schools in Capalonga. Through these platforms, participants will be oriented on key findings, guided in using the handbook templates and monitoring tools, and supported in contextualizing procedures to their school settings, with the goal of strengthening shared understanding, promoting consistent practices, and enabling collaborative problem-solving to improve SBM implementation in the Division of Camarines Norte

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that teachers and school heads in the Division of Camarines Norte possess an excellent Extent of understanding of School-Based Management (SBM), particularly in its vision, purpose, structures, and roles, while support systems and features remain areas requiring further strengthening. The extent of SBM implementation was consistently rated at an Exemplary Extent across leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and resource management, with curriculum and learning emerging as the highest-rated dimension. A significant positive relationship was established between understanding and implementation, underscoring that deeper conceptual understanding leads to stronger practice. Best practices were evident in collaborative leadership, contextualized and learner-centered curriculum, participatory accountability, and transparent resource mobilization, demonstrating SBM's capacity to foster inclusive and effective governance. However, persistent challenges remain, including limited stakeholder participation, inadequate human resources, insufficient funding, and difficulty in securing external resources, which hinder the full realization of SBM's goals. To address these gaps, a School-Based Management Handbook was developed as a strategic intervention to consolidate policies, tools, and best practices into one accessible guide for schools, ensuring consistency and sustainability of SBM practices.

It is recommended that school administrators and the Department of Education continue to provide capacity-building programs that deepen understanding of SBM's features and support systems. Schools should institutionalize participatory mechanisms that strengthen stakeholder involvement and collaboration with parents, local government units, and community partners. Resource mobilization strategies must be enhanced through improved financial support, transparent allocation, and stronger partnerships with external stakeholders. The SBM Handbook should be adopted as a working reference to guide school heads, teachers, and coordinators in planning, implementation, monitoring, and accountability processes. Furthermore, supportive policies should

be reinforced to sustain SBM at both school and division Extents. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to expand the scope of the study to include more schools across different divisions, explore additional factors such as leadership styles and organizational culture, and employ mixed-method approaches to gain broader insights into SBM's impact on educational quality and governance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher sincerely thanks the following individuals and groups for their support in completing this study: Dr. Sonia S. Carbonell, Dean of the Graduate School; Dr. Analyn D. Ramos, research adviser; and the Thesis Committee—Dr. Erlinda J. Porcincula, Dr. Jennifer S. Rubio, and Dr. Anicia S. Madarang—for their guidance and constructive feedback. Appreciation is also extended to Mr. Crestito R. Morcilla, Public Schools Division Superintendent of Camarines Norte, for granting approval to conduct the study, and to the school heads, teachers, and master teachers of Camarines Norte Senior High School, Moreno Integrated School, Basud National High School, Gumaus National High School, Bulala Elementary School, and Daet Elementary School for their participation and valuable inputs. The researcher likewise acknowledges Ms. Jamila M. Macapundag, Panel Secretary, for administrative assistance, and expresses heartfelt gratitude to her family and friend for their unwavering encouragement and support. Above all, the researcher thanks Almighty God for His guidance and strength throughout this academic journey.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, A. G. K. (2020). School-based management (SBM) practices in Malaysia: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(9), 822–838. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v10-i9/7870>
2. Caldwell, B. J. (2005). *School-based management* (Vol. 3). UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000141025>
3. De Guzman, A. B. (2006). Reforms in Philippine basic education viewed from key elements of successful school-based management (SBM) schools. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 5(1), 55–71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-006-6985-2>
4. Department of Education. (2012, November 29). DepEd Order No. 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/>
5. Dulog, S. M. (2024). The challenges and opportunities in educational administration: A perspective from the Philippines. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence*, 1(3), 79–84. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11045569>
6. Maca, M. N. (2019). School-based management in the Philippines: Fostering innovations in the public education system. *Romblon State University Research Journal*, 2(1), 35–59. <https://doi.org/10.58780/rsurj.v2i1.10>
7. Patrinos, H. A. (2019). School-based management and learning outcomes: Experimental evidence from Colima, Mexico. World Bank Research Paper. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/316261560168539394/pdf/School-Based-Management-and-Learning-Outcomes-Experimental-Evidence-from-Colima-Mexico.pdf>
8. Republic of the Philippines. (2001, August 11). Republic Act No. 9155: An act instituting a framework of governance for basic education, establishing authority and accountability, renaming the Department of Education, Culture and Sports as the Department of Education, and for other purposes. The Lawphil Project. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2001/ra_9155_2001.html