SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

EXPLORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVISED SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TO THE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE: BASIS FOR DEVELOPING STRATEGIES ADDRESSING ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES

Ammi Grace L. Ramos

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the implementation of the revised School-Based Management (SBM) system in Philippine schools, focusing on its impact on stakeholder engagement and school performance. SBM, a decentralized approach to school governance, empowered schools with greater autonomy in decision-making related to curriculum, teaching, leadership, governance, and resource management. The research assessed the effectiveness of SBM practices in six dimensions: curriculum and teaching, learning environment, leadership, governance and accountability, human resource development, and finance/resource mobilization. It also explored stakeholder engagement, specifically in terms of involvement, communication, decision-making, support systems, and health and wellness. Data were collected from 10 Level III SBM schools in the Division of Laguna, with a total of 200 respondents, including school leaders, teachers, parents, and community members.

Quantitative analysis revealed that the implementation of SBM was generally effective, with 80% of respondents reporting active involvement in school management activities. The results also showed a positive correlation between stakeholder engagement and school performance, with a statistically significant relationship ($p < 0.05$) between high SBM practices and improved OPCRF ratings, where 75% of schools achieved an "Outstanding" performance rating. In particular, leadership (mean = 4.5) and governance and accountability (mean = 4.3) scored the highest, indicating robust stakeholder participation in these areas. However, curriculum and teaching (mean = 3.2) and the learning environment (mean = 3.1) showed lower scores, reflecting areas where SBM implementation had less impact.

The study identified key challenges, such as documentation inefficiencies and resource allocation imbalances, which hindered the full potential of SBM. Despite these challenges, the research concluded that SBM significantly contributed to school improvement by fostering collaboration, transparency, and accountability. The study recommended streamlining documentation processes, enhancing resource distribution, and providing continuous training for stakeholders to improve SBM outcomes and ensure sustained improvements in school performance. The findings offered valuable insights for policymakers and educational leaders aiming to optimize SBM practices for better educational outcomes in the Philippines.

I. INTRODUCTION

Global education systems saw significant adjustments to address the changing demands of the 21st century. School-based management (SBM) emerged as one of the most extensively implemented solutions within this framework. SBM granted schools differing levels of autonomy in decision-making, curriculum development, and resource management, enabling them to customize their strategies to meet the distinct requirements of their students and communities.

With the revised guidelines for School-Based Management, DO No. 007, s. 2024, this aimed at facilitating school improvement, having been a leader in the implementation of SBM and implemented a tiered strategy that granted schools escalating degrees of autonomy contingent upon their success. The significance of SBM lies in its potential to address the gaps and organizational challenges in Philippine education.

Through the decentralization of authority, SBM enhanced accountability, stimulated creativity, and optimized the allocation of educational resources to promote student success. SBM fundamentally advocated that individuals nearest to the students—namely administrators, teachers, parents, and the community—were optimally situated to determine the school's trajectory and resource distribution.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

According to Dulog (2024), educational institutions faced numerous challenges, including inadequate facilities, teacher shortages, and limited resources, and as emphasized by Cariaga (2023), strengthening and improving the government's capacity to develop effective teaching and learning environments was essential.

Additionally, stakeholders such as businesses and industry, parents, administrators, and teachers—who were integral to the teaching and learning process—had to demonstrate greater commitment and support. However, during the process of institutionalizing SBM, several implementation gaps emerged. One of the key challenges observed across schools at various levels was the issue of documentation, which led to an increased workload for teaching personnel. Furthermore, redundancies in some of the indicators complicated the implementation process, contributing to inefficiencies.

Global trends and local needs have recently driven the introduction of innovative education programs, projects, and activities within the Philippine education system. Additionally, frameworks focused on enhancing people's effectiveness have been developed to complement organizational effectiveness, aiming for greater success within educational institutions. This research sought to make a meaningful contribution to the ongoing dialogue surrounding effective school management, with a particular focus on the recently revised guidelines for School-Based Management (SBM). The main goal of the study was to make it easier for school administrators to make decisions based on facts. This will help future efforts to make sure that educational changes not only meet national goals but also take into account local issues and needs.

II. METHODOLOGY

Research Instruments

This study established and utilized multiple research tools to successfully investigate the best practices of Level III School-Based Management (SBM) schools employing the revised system and their effects on stakeholder engagement and school performance. The researcher employed a standardized questionnaire from the School-Based Management (SBM) Self-Assessment Checklist (Enclosure to DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024) and developed a structured survey of multiple-choice and Likert-scale items to collect data. This survey sought to evaluate the correlation between School-Based Management (SBM), stakeholder participation, and academic success. Questions were developed according to best practices recognized in the literature, ensuring the instrument's pertinence and dependability.

Before deployment, the survey was tested with a select group of stakeholders to ensure clarity, comprehensiveness, and cultural appropriateness. Insights from the pilot testing prompted improvements in the instruments, augmenting their efficacy for the primary investigation. Ethical issues were integrated into the instruments, with explicit explanations of the research's objective, the voluntary nature of participation, and guarantees of anonymity. These instruments were collectively meant to generate strong data to guide the creation of strategies for enhancing SBM practices and resolving the organizational constraints faced by schools.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Implementation of Schools in the Dimensions of the School-Based Management Revised System

The level of the implementation of the schools in the dimensions of the school-based management in terms of curriculum and teaching, learning environment, leadership, governance and accountability, human resource management and team development, and finance and resource management and mobilization were treated statistically using weighted mean and standard deviation.

Table 1 shows that the best practices in the dimension of school-based management in terms of curriculum and teaching are frequently well observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *5.960*, which is verbally interpreted as *High*. This indicates that schools actively uphold effective teaching and curriculum practices.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the conduct of test item analysis to inform teaching and learning processes, with a mean of 6.41, interpreted as *Very High*. Additionally, teachers are observed to integrate topics promoting peace and DepEd core values with a mean of *6.23*, prepare contextualized learning materials *(6.16)*, and engage local industries to strengthen TLE-TVL courses *(6.21)*, all of which are verbally interpreted as *Very High*. These results highlight strong implementation in these key areas.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Table 1. Level of Implementation of Schools in the Dimension of Revised School-Based Management in terms of Curriculum and Teaching

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Grade 3 learners achieve the proficiency level for each cluster of early language, literacy, and numeracy skills	5.17	1.51	Somewhat High
Grade 6, 10, and 12 learners achieve the proficiency level in all 21st century skills and core learning areas in the National Achievement Test (NAT)	5.68	1.12	High
School-based ALS learners attain certification as elementary and junior high school completers	5.83	1.13	High
Teachers prepare contextualized learning materials responsive to the needs of learners	6.16	0.88	Very High
Teachers conduct remediation activities to address learning gaps in reading and comprehension, science and technology, and mathematics	6.00	0.91	High
Teachers integrate topics promoting peace and DepEd core values	6.23	0.84	Very High
The school conducts test item analysis to inform its teaching and learning process	6.41	0.91	Very High
The school engages local industries to strengthen its TLE-TVL course offerings	6.21	0.85	Very High
Weighted Mean	**5.960**		
SD	**1.019**		
Verbal Interpretation	**High**		

However, the lowest-rated practice is the achievement of proficiency in early language, literacy, and numeracy skills among Grade 3 learners, with a mean of *5.17*, categorized as *Somewhat High*. While this still indicates a positive level of implementation, it suggests a potential area for further enhancement.

Overall, the data reflect a strong commitment to improving curriculum and teaching practices, though efforts may be needed to further support foundational literacy and numeracy skills at the early grade levels.

Shepherd (2021) investigated a teacher-led intervention designed to increase student academic achievement. The study focused on specific strategies implemented by teachers to provide targeted support for students who were struggling academically. Results indicated that the intervention led to notable improvements in student performance, particularly in reading and math skills. Moreover, the research highlighted the importance of teacher training and collaboration in effectively delivering these interventions.

Table 2. Level of Implementation of Schools in the Dimension of Revised School-Based Management in terms of Learning Environment

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
The school has zero bullying incidence	5.66	1.15	High
The school has zero child abuse incidence	5.92	1.17	High
The school has reduced its drop-out incidence	5.96	0.99	High
The school conducts culture-sensitive activities	6.16	0.95	Very High
The school provides access to learning experiences for disadvantaged, OSYs, and adult learners	6.15	0.97	High
The school has a functional school-based ALS program	5.91	1.34	High
The school has a functional child-protection committee	6.37	0.82	Very High
The school has a functional DRRM plan	6.55	0.67	Very High
The school has a functional support mechanism for mental wellness	6.28	0.78	Very High
The school has special education and PWD-friendly facilities	5.99	1.08	High
Weighted Mean	**6.095**		
Standard Deviation	**0.991**		
Verbal Interpretation	**High**		

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Table 2 shows that the best practices in the dimension of School-Based Management in terms of Learning Environment are frequently well observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *6.095*, which is verbally interpreted as *High*. This means that schools have established a conducive and supportive learning environment.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the presence of a functional Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) plan, with a mean of *6.55*, interpreted as *Very High*. Additionally, the presence of a functional child-protection committee *(6.37)*, functional support mechanisms for mental wellness *(6.28)*, and the conduct of culture-sensitive activities *(6.16)* were also interpreted as *Very High*, indicating strong institutional commitment to ensuring a safe and inclusive learning space.

Meanwhile, all other indicators, such as zero bullying incidence *(5.66)*, zero child abuse incidence *(5.92)*, reduced dropout rate *(5.96)*, and access to learning for disadvantaged groups *(6.15)*, were interpreted as *High*. The lowest-rated indicator is the presence of special education and PWD-friendly facilities, with a mean of *5.99*, which, although still categorized as *High*, may indicate areas for further improvement in making the school more accessible and inclusive for students with special needs.

Overall, the data reflects that schools have implemented strong measures to create a safe, inclusive, and well-supported learning environment, particularly in terms of disaster preparedness, child protection, and mental wellness support. However, there may be opportunities to further enhance special education and facilities for learners with disabilities to ensure a fully inclusive educational environment.

Cabral-Gouveia, Menezes, and Neves (2023) conducted a systematic review of educational strategies aimed at reducing the achievement gap among students. The review identified various interventions, such as differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, and targeted support programs, that had shown effectiveness in promoting equity in educational outcomes. The authors stressed the importance of a holistic approach that considered socioeconomic, cultural, and individual factors influencing student performance. Additionally, the review highlighted the role of teacher training and professional development in implementing these strategies effectively. Overall, the findings advocated for sustained efforts and tailored initiatives to bridge the achievement gap and enhance educational equity.

Table 3. Level of Implementation of Schools in the Dimension of Revised School-Based Management in terms of Leadership

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
The school develops a strategic plan	6.27	0.81	Very High
The school has a functional school-community planning team	6.25	0.78	Very high
The school has a functional Supreme Student Government/Supreme Pupil Government	6.43	0.77	Very High
The school innovates in its provision of frontline services to stakeholders	6.29	0.77	Very High
Weighted Mean	**6.309**		
Standard Deviation	**0.783**		
Verbal Interpretation	**Very High**		

Table 3 shows that the best practices in the dimension of School-Based Management in terms of Leadership are always observed, as shown by the overall average mean of *6.309*, which is verbally interpreted as *Very High*. This means that leadership practices in schools are well-established and consistently observed.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the presence of a functional Supreme Student Government/Supreme Pupil Government, with a mean of *6.43*, reflecting a *Very High* level of implementation. This highlights the school's strong commitment to student leadership and governance. Other leadership practices, including strategic planning *(6.27)*, the presence of a functional school-community planning team *(6.25)*, and innovations in frontline services *(6.29)*, were also rated *Very High*, indicating an effective and positive approach to school leadership. These results demonstrate that school leadership is a key strength in the implementation of School-Based Management, as evidenced by the well-established strategic planning, active student governance, and effective coordination with the community.

Educational leaders played a pivotal role in shaping the success of schools by focusing on students, teachers, and the broader institutional mission and vision. Mitchell's (2017) widely accepted model of instructional leadership emphasized three key areas: setting the school's

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

mission, overseeing the curriculum, and creating a supportive learning environment. This model underscored the importance of evaluating how the curriculum and teaching methods impacted student learning and performance.

Table 4. Level of Implementation of Schools in the Dimension of Revised School-Based Management in terms of Governance and Accountability

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
The school's strategic plan is operationalized through an implementation plan	6.17	0.80	Very High
The school has a functional School Governance Council (SGC)	6.39	0.79	Very High
The school has a functional Parent-Teacher Association (PTA)	6.50	0.64	Very High
The school collaborates with stakeholders and other schools in strengthening partnerships	6.44	0.68	Very High
The school monitors and evaluates its programs, projects, and activities	6.32	0.77	Very High
The school maintains an average rating of satisfactory from its internal and external stakeholders	6.32	0.79	Very High
Weighted Mean	**6.357**		
Standard Deviation	**0.745**		
Verbal Interpretation	**Very High**		

Table 4 indicates that the best practices in the dimension of School-Based Management in terms of Governance and Accountability are always observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *6.357*, which is verbally interpreted as *Very High*. This means that governance and accountability practices in the school are well-established and consistently observed.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the functionality of the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), with a mean of *6.50*, highlighting the strong collaboration between parents and the school. Other indicators, such as stakeholder collaboration *(6.44)*, the presence of a functional School Governance Council *(6.39)*, and monitoring and evaluation of programs *(6.32)*, also received a *Very High* interpretation, indicating a well-structured approach to governance and accountability. The results demonstrate that the school has effectively implemented governance and accountability measures.

Another study by Lubienski (2017) investigated the role of accountability in enhancing school improvement initiatives. The author analyzed different accountability frameworks and their effects on educational practices and outcomes. The study discovered that well-structured accountability systems prompted schools to adopt data-driven methodologies, promoting a culture of ongoing improvement. It also pointed out that accountability could yield both beneficial and detrimental effects, affecting how schools set their priorities.

The study also discovered that the success of SBM initiatives was closely linked to the clarity and consistency of accountability measures; schools with well-defined and reliable accountability systems were better positioned to implement SBM effectively. This variance in accountability across different contexts meant that some schools experienced greater challenges than others in achieving their goals. Overall, the study emphasized the intricacies of accountability in influencing school improvement efforts and the necessity for careful implementation.

Table 5. Level of Implementation of Schools in the Dimension of Revised School-Based Management in terms of Human Resource and Team Development

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
School personnel achieve an average rating of very satisfactory in the individual performance commitment and review	6.29	0.78	Very High
The school achieves an average rating of very satisfactory in the office performance commitment and review	6.33	0.75	Very High
The school conducts needs-based Learning Action Cells and Learning & Development activities	6.43	0.68	Very High
The school facilitates the promotion and continuous professional development of its personnel	6.30	0.65	Very High

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

The school recognizes and rewards milestone achievements of its personnel	6.40	0.69	Very High
The school facilitates receipt of correct salaries, allowances and other additional compensation in a timely manner	6.41	0.56	Very High
Teacher workload is distributed fairly and equitably	6.21	0.81	Very High
Average Weighted Mean	**6.337**		
Standard Deviation **Verbal Interpretation**	**0.702** **Very High**		

Table 5 shows that the best practices in the dimension of School-Based Management in terms of Human Resource and Team Development are always observed, as shown by the overall average mean of *6.337*, which is verbally interpreted as *Very High*. This means that the school effectively supports and develops its personnel, ensuring a well-functioning and motivated workforce.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the conduct of needs-based Learning Action Cells and Learning & Development activities *(6.43)*, along with recognizing and rewarding personnel achievements *(6.40)*, and ensuring the timely receipt of salaries and benefits *(6.41)*. These ratings highlight the school's strong commitment to professional development, employee recognition, and financial well-being. All other indicators, including performance commitment and review *(6.29, 6.33)*, professional development facilitation *(6.30)*, and equitable teacher workload distribution *(6.21)*, also received *Very High* interpretation, reinforcing the idea that personnel support and development are consistently observed and prioritized.

The results demonstrate that the school effectively implements human resource and team development initiatives, ensuring personnel satisfaction, professional growth, and a fair working environment.

Human resource management was a tool used to utilize individuals in achieving organizational goals (Silva & Lima, 2018; Boon et al., 2019). The purpose of human resource management is to increase individual productive contributions. In this context, human resources were assets that needed to be managed carefully and in line with the needs of the organization, which in this case was education.

Education played a very important role in improving the quality of human resources (Rahmi et al., 2020). Education has a significant influence on the economic growth of a nation. In improving the quality of the Indonesian population, the government did not use a system independent of the private sector and the community. There was an inseparable relationship between the two in their role to improve equity and the quality of education.

Table 6. Level of Implementation of Schools in the Dimension of Revised School-Based Management in terms of Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
The school inspects its infrastructure and facilities	6.19	0.605	Very High
The school initiates improvement of its infrastructure and facilities	6.27	0.717	Very High
The school has a functional library	6.17	0.999	Very High
The school has functional water, electric, and internet facilities	6.36	0.728	Very High
The school has functional computer laboratory/classroom	6.26	0.762	Very High
The school achieves a 75-100% utilization rate of its Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE)	6.31	0.754	Very High
The school liquidates 100% of its utilized MOOE	6.32	0.744	Very High
Weighted Mean	**6.268**		
Standard Deviation **Verbal Interpretation**	**0.758** **Very High**		

Table 6 indicates that the best practices in the dimension of School-Based Management in terms of Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization are always observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *6.268*, which is verbally interpreted as *Very High*. This means that the school effectively manages its financial and material resources, ensuring best use and proper accountability.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the functionality of water, electric, and internet facilities *(6.36)*, emphasizing the school's commitment to maintaining essential services. Other key practices, such as MOOE utilization *(6.31)* and proper liquidation

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

of funds *(6.32)*, also interpreted as *Very High*, highlighting the school's strong financial governance. All other indicators, including infrastructure inspection *(6.19*), improvement initiatives *(6.27)*, library functionality *(6.17)*, and functional computer laboratories *(6.26)*, were also interpreted as *Very High*, demonstrating an accomplished approach to resource management and mobilization.

The results imply that the school has a capable financial and resource management system that ensures infrastructure maintenance, proper fund utilization, and availability of essential facilities.

According to Ladd (2021), effective finance and resource management within SBM led to greater transparency and accountability. By continuously monitoring how resources were distributed across different sectors of the school, leaders ensured that all investments contributed directly to improving the quality of education. Furthermore, ongoing communication with stakeholders ensured that financial decisions remained aligned with the broader goals of school improvement.

In summary, managing finances and resources effectively under the SBM model was essential for achieving school improvement. By using data to guide financial decisions and strategically allocating resources, schools created environments where students could excel. Whether it was through investing in teacher professional development, improving facilities, or enhancing learning materials, finance and resource management played a key role in the successful implementation of SBM, helping schools achieve sustainable improvements and long-term educational success.

Level of Stakeholder Engagement

The level of stakeholder engagement as perceived by the respondents in terms of involvement, communication, decision-making, needs assessment, support system, and health and wellness was treated statistically using weighted mean and standard deviation.

Table 7. Level of Stakeholder Engagement in terms of Involvement

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
The stakeholders are involved in the early stages of SBM planning and strategy development	6.28	0.78	Very High
The stakeholders are engaged in evaluating SBM progress and outcomes	6.25	0.81	Very High
The stakeholders have power in decision-making in the implementation of SBM initiatives	6.24	0.83	Very High
The diverse stakeholders are included in the SBM processes	6.19	0.85	Very High
The stakeholders receive regular updates on the progress, challenges and successes of the SBM efforts	6.25	0.83	Very High
Weighted Mean	**6.243**		
Standard Deviation	**0.820**		
Verbal Interpretation	**Very High**		

Table 7 indicates that the level of stakeholder engagement in terms of involvement is always observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *6.243*, which is verbally interpreted as *Very High*. This means that stakeholders are actively engaged in the School-Based Management (SBM) processes, particularly in planning, evaluation, and decision-making.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the involvement of stakeholders in the early stages of SBM planning and strategy development *(6.28)*, highlighting the importance of collaboration from the beginning of the decision-making process.

Other aspects, such as stakeholders' engagement in evaluating SBM progress *(6.25)*, decision-making power in SBM implementation *(6.24)*, and receiving regular updates on SBM efforts *(6.25)*, also interpreted as *Very High*, reinforcing the idea that stakeholders play an essential role in school governance. Additionally, the inclusion of diverse stakeholders in SBM processes *(6.19)* was also rated *Very High*. The results demonstrate that stakeholders are highly engaged and actively participate in different aspects of SBM implementation, including planning, evaluation, and decision-making.

According to Cruzat, Cruzat, and Javillonar (2022), stakeholders possessed a strong understanding of the importance of partnerships in achieving school goals. This awareness enabled schools to effectively rely on their stakeholders for implementing projects and activities.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Stakeholders expressed confidence in their ability to collaborate with schools based on clearly defined structures, roles, and responsibilities.

Moreover, stakeholder involvement was evident throughout the school community. The extent of this involvement was influenced by stakeholders' perceptions of partnership and school practices. Positive perceptions significantly enhanced participation in school initiatives.

Table 8. Level of Stakeholder Engagement in terms of Communication

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
There is transparency in the communication between the organization and stakeholders regarding SBM goals and progress	6.18	0.83	Very High
There are communication channels (emails, meetings, reports, social medias) to engage stakeholders in SBM activities	6.17	0.76	Very High
There are gathered feedback from stakeholders regarding SBM activities	6.23	0.85	Very High
There are continuous communication updates or changes in SBM-related initiatives to stakeholders	6.23	0.76	Very High
Stakeholders receive timely responses to their inquiries and concerns related to SBM activities	6.26	0.87	Very High
Weighted Mean	**6.214**		
Standard Deviation	**0.815**		
Verbal Interpretation	**Very High**		

Table 8 indicates that the level of stakeholder engagement in terms of communication is always observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *6.214*, which is verbally interpreted as *Very High*. This means that communication between the school and stakeholders is transparent, responsive, and well-facilitated through various channels.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the timely response to stakeholder inquiries and concerns related to SBM activities *(6.26)*, highlighting the school's commitment to addressing stakeholder needs efficiently. Other aspects, such as gathering feedback from stakeholders *(6.23)* and providing continuous updates on SBM-related initiatives (*6.23)*, also interpreted as *Very High*, emphasizing the importance of maintaining open lines of communication.

Additionally, ensuring transparency in communication regarding SBM goals and progress *(6.18)* and having multiple communication channels like emails, meetings, reports, and social media *(6.17)* were also interpreted as *Very High*, showing that the school employs various means to keep stakeholders informed and engaged.

The results demonstrate that the school has established a highly effective communication system that fosters transparency, stakeholder engagement, and timely responsiveness. The Department of Education (DepEd, 2015) strengthened the roles of School Governing Councils and School Improvement Planning teams, particularly through the implementation of School Report Cards. SBM became increasingly inclusive, addressing diverse learning contexts and bolstering stakeholder commitment to improving student performance and school potential. Implementing SBM improved access to quality education and enhanced student achievement (Cabardo, 2016; Tapayan et al., 2016).

Table 9. Level of Stakeholder Engagement in terms of Decision-making

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
The stakeholders are part in the decision-making process for key SBM initiatives	6.14	0.77	High
The stakeholders are satisfied with the organization's decision-making process in SBM	6.12	0.80	High
There are clear roles and responsibilities defined for stakeholders in the decision-making process	6.15	0.79	High
The stakeholders have adequate roles in shaping the direction of SBM efforts in the organization	6.18	0.76	Very High

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

The stakeholders have opportunities to influence key decisions at multiple stages throughout the SBM process, from planning to implementation	6.13	0.84	High
Weighted Mean	**6.144**		
Standard Deviation **Verbal Interpretation**	**0.791** **High**		

Table 9 indicates that the level of stakeholder engagement in terms of decision-making is frequently observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *6.144*, which is verbally interpreted as *High*. This means that stakeholders are actively involved in the decision-making processes of School-Based Management (SBM), although there is still room for further improvement. Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the adequate roles of stakeholders in shaping SBM efforts *(6.18),* which is the only item interpreted as *Very High*.

This highlights the significant role of stakeholders in influencing the direction of SBM initiatives. Other aspects, such as stakeholders' participation in key SBM decisions *(6.14),* satisfaction with the organization's decision-making process *(6.12),* clearly defined roles and responsibilities *(6.15),* and opportunities to influence decisions throughout the SBM process *(6.13),* all interpreted *High*.

This implies that while stakeholder engagement in decision-making is frequently observed, there may be opportunities to enhance their level of involvement further. The results demonstrate that stakeholders are actively engaged in the decision-making processes of SBM, particularly in shaping school initiatives and having clear roles in governance.

However, since most indicators are interpreted as *High* rather than *Very High*, this implies that there may be opportunities to further strengthen stakeholder participation in decision-making structures. Stakeholders were crucial to school management because they worked alongside administrators to create a supportive environment for teaching and learning (Pelayo, 2018). The involvement of stakeholders in schools and the ability of leaders to influence them had an impact on academic performance outcomes. Their ability to maximize the utilization of available material and human resources could potentially affect school performance.

Table 10. Level of Stakeholder Engagement in terms of Needs Assessment

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
The stakeholders are included in assessing the needs and expectations of the organization to SBM	6.08	0.83	High
The stakeholders revisit or reassess the organization's needs to ensure SBM initiatives remain relevant	6.10	0.88	High
The stakeholders are connected in the SBM initiatives in addressing the needs and concerns	6.14	0.77	High
The stakeholders are open in the organization to incorporating innovative suggestions or ideas into SBM practices	6.19	0.80	Ver High
The stakeholders actively participate in identifying gaps and opportunities in the current SBM practices to help guide future initiatives	6.21	0.84	Very High
Weighted Mean	**6.143**		
Standard Deviation **Verbal Interpretation**	**0.825** **High**		

Table 10 indicates that the level of stakeholder engagement in terms of needs assessment is frequently observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *6.143*, which is verbally interpreted as *High*. This means that stakeholders are actively involved in evaluating and addressing the school's needs, ensuring that School-Based Management (SBM) initiatives remain relevant and effective.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practices include stakeholders actively participating in identifying gaps and opportunities in SBM practices *(6.21)* and openness to incorporating innovative ideas into SBM *(6.19),* both of which are interpreted as *Very High*. This highlights the stakeholders' commitment to continuous suggestion for improvement and forward-thinking solutions.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Other aspects, such as stakeholders reassessing the organization's needs *(6.10)*, being connected to SBM initiatives in addressing concerns *(6.14)*, and being included in assessing the organization's needs and expectations *(6.08)*, interpreted as *High*. This indicates that while needs assessment is a recognized and practiced activity, there is still room to further enhance stakeholder engagement in this process.

The results demonstrate that stakeholders play a crucial role in assessing school needs and contributing to SBM improvements. However, since most indicators are rated *High* rather than *Very High*, further efforts can be made to deepen stakeholder involvement in identifying needs, encouraging diverse inputs, and integrating their recommendations into the school's strategic planning process.

As cited by Nguyen, Mohamed, and Panuwatwanich (2018) from Beringer et al. (2012), stakeholder management had played a critical role in project performance in complex projects as a key success factor. Stakeholder management did not focus solely on individual stakeholders but also accounted for the influence stakeholders had on one another in the complex interactions of multiple and potentially interdependent parties. The overall goal of engagement was to achieve a transparent decision-making process, with greater input from stakeholders and their support for the decisions that were made (Cascetta et al., 2015).

Table 11. Level of Stakeholder Engagement in terms of Support System

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
The stakeholders are involved in the organization's support about SBM initiatives through seminars, trainings and guidance	6.17	0.82	Very High
The stakeholders have the access in the support if they encounter challenges or barriers related to SBM activities	6.21	0.82	Very High
The stakeholders provide adequate support in the organization's SBM	6.26	0.76	Very High
The stakeholders provide support through networking assistance	6.30	0.78	Very High
The stakeholders have access to peer support networks, allowing them to learn from each other's experiences and successes in implementing SBM strategies	6.30	0.84	Very High
Weighted Mean	**6.247**		
Standard Deviation	**0.805**		
Verbal Interpretation	**Very High**		

Table 11 indicates that the level of stakeholder engagement in terms of support system is always observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *6.247*, which is verbally interpreted as *Very High*. This means that stakeholders actively contribute to supporting School-Based Management (SBM) initiatives through training, networking, in implementing SBM Strategies.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practices include stakeholders providing support through networking assistance *(6.30)* and having access to peer support networks to learn from each other's experiences *(6.30)*, both interpreted as *Very High*. These results highlight the strong collaboration among stakeholders in strengthening SBM implementation.

Other aspects, such as stakeholders providing adequate support in SBM *(6.26)*, having access to support when facing challenges *(6.21)*, and involvement in training and guidance programs *(6.17)*, also interpreted as *Very High*. This indicates that the school has successfully established a strong support system, allowing stakeholders to actively participate in SBM efforts.

The results demonstrate that stakeholders play a vital role in supporting SBM initiatives by offering guidance, networking opportunities, and peer learning platforms. The consistently high ratings across all indicators reflect a well-developed system where stakeholders are empowered to contribute effectively. Stakeholders' participation in every school-initiated activity relevant to its improvement was essential. The success of a school's goals and objectives towards creating an effective and healthy learning environment resulted from the participation and collaboration of every school stakeholder, including principals, teachers, students, parents, business organizations, and government and non-government organizations (Cruzat et al., 2022).

Ulfatin et al. (2022) cited the study by De Grauwe (2005), which examined the positive effects of SBM on student outcomes. The study emphasized that SBM enhanced community and teacher involvement in decision-making, fostering a sense of ownership among stakeholders. This increased engagement led to more tailored educational strategies that addressed local needs effectively. Teachers

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

experienced greater autonomy and job satisfaction, which contributed to improved teaching practices. Ultimately, the findings suggested that SBM was correlated with higher academic achievement and overall better student performance.

Table 12. Level of Stakeholder Engagement in terms of Health and Wellness

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
The stakeholders are involved in SBM initiatives which promote the health and well-being	6.20	0.87	Very High
The stakeholders are concerned in the organization assessment in the impact of SBM practices on the physical and mental health	6.26	0.75	Very High
The stakeholders' support well-being in the context of SBM	6.30	0.76	Very High
The stakeholders are part of wellness programs and community health initiatives set by the organization	6.32	0.74	Very High
The stakeholders have access to counselling services or support systems that address mental health challenges related to their roles in SBM initiatives	6.27	0.79	Very High
Weighted Mean	**6.271**		
Standard Deviation	**0.783**		
Verbal Interpretation	**Very High**		

Table 12 indicates that the level of stakeholder engagement in terms of health and wellness is always observed, as reflected in the overall average mean of *6.271*, which is verbally interpreted as *Very High*. This means that stakeholders actively participate in SBM initiatives that promote physical and mental well-being.

Among the specific indicators, the highest-rated practice is the stakeholders' involvement in wellness programs and community health initiatives *(6.32)*, highlighting the school's commitment to fostering a healthy environment.

Other aspects, such as stakeholders supporting well-being in SBM *(6.30)*, being concerned with the impact of SBM practices on health *(6.26) and* accessing counselling services or support systems for mental health challenges *(6.27)*, also interpreted as *Very High*. This indicates a strong institutional effort in ensuring that health and wellness are integrated into SBM initiatives.

The results demonstrate that stakeholders play a crucial role in promoting health and wellness within SBM initiatives by engaging in wellness programs, supporting mental health efforts, and ensuring that SBM practices positively impact overall well-being. The consistently high ratings across all indicators reflect a well-established system that prioritizes health, making it an integral part of school management and stakeholder engagement.

Avidov and Ungar (2019) highlighted that community engagement fostered stronger relationships between schools and families, creating a supportive environment for students. Their study revealed that when community members were involved, there was an increase in trust and collaboration among all stakeholders. The author emphasized that effective communication was essential for ensuring that community voices were heard in the assessment process.

Mean Level of School Performance

The level of school performance in terms of Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) was treated statistically using mean.

Table 13. Level of School Performance in terms of OPCRF

School	OPCRF Rating for 3 Consecutive Years			Average	Verbal Interpretation
	2022	2023	2024		
A	4.580	4.700	4.890	4.723	Outstanding
B	4.500	4.895	4.895	4.763	Outstanding
C	4.510	4.686	4.700	4.632	Outstanding
D	4.670	4.720	4.750	4.713	Outstanding
E	4.600	4.740	4.800	4.713	Outstanding

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

F	4.580	4.620	4.700	4.633	Outstanding
G	4.400	4.430	4.273	4.368	Very Satisfactory
H	4.500	4.500	4.620	4.540	Outstanding
I	4.690	4.760	4.800	4.750	Outstanding

Table 13 presents the Mean Level of School Performance in terms of OPCRF (Office Performance Commitment and Review Form) ratings for three consecutive years (2022, 2023, and 2024). As seen in the table, the ratings are consistently increasing over the years.

The data indicates that all schools achieved an Outstanding rating, with average scores above 4.500, which falls within the highest performance category based on the given scale except with School G with a Very Satisfactory Rating.

The means that majority of the schools are consistently demonstrated high levels of performance, as evidenced by their Outstanding OPCRF ratings..

By analyzing a variety of schools that implemented SBM, the authors identified effective strategies for managing resources equitably, such as targeted funding for underrepresented groups and community engagement in decision-making processes. Their research indicated that when schools actively prioritized equity in resource distribution, it not only enhanced student engagement but also led to improved academic outcomes across the board. Furthermore, the study provided actionable recommendations for school leaders, suggesting they adopt practices that considered the unique needs of all students, such as differentiated support and collaborative planning (Theoharis & O'Toole, 2019).

According to Carvalho et al. (2021), as cited in the study of Davies (2006), the School Improvement Plan (SIP) served as a foundational tool for schools, providing a clear strategic direction that outlined specific goals and objectives. By establishing these elements, the SIP guided educational institutions in their efforts to enhance student learning and overall educational outcomes. It helped ensure that initiatives were not only effective but also relevant to the needs of the community, fostering a strong alignment between school activities and local expectations.

Table 14. Test of Relationship between the Implementation of the Schools in the Dimensions of Revised School-Based Management and Stakeholder Engagement

School-Based Management	Stakeholder Engagement	R-value	Verbal Interpretation	p-value	Verbal Interpretation
Curriculum and Teaching	Involvement	0.5209	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	Significant
	Communication	0.5230		0.0000	
	Decision-making	0.4518		0.0000	
	Needs assessment	0.5552		0.0000	
	Support System	0.6008		0.0000	
	Health and Wellness	0.5461		0.0000	
Learning Environment	Involvement	0.6806	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	Significant
	Communication	0.6432		0.0000	
	Decision-making	0.6096		0.0000	
	Needs assessment	0.6208		0.0000	
	Support System	0.7220	Strong Positive Correlation	0.0000	
	Health and Wellness	0.6282	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	
Leadership	Involvement	0.6274	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	Significant
	Communication	0.6302		0.0000	
	Decision-making	0.6772		0.0000	

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

	Needs assessment	0.7155	Strong Positive Correlation	0.0000	
	Support System	0.6694	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	
	Health and Wellness	0.6277		0.0000	
Governance and Accountability	Involvement	0.6359	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	Significant
	Communication	0.6323		0.0000	
	Decision-making	0.7108	Strong Positive Correlation	0.0000	
	Needs assessment	0.6521	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	
	Support System	0.6513		0.0000	
	Health and Wellness	0.6163		0.0000	
Human Resource and Team Development	Involvement	0.6897	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	Significant
	Communication	0.6435		0.0000	
	Decision-making	0.7542	Strong Positive Correlation	0.0000	
	Needs assessment	0.6884	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	
	Support System	0.6516		0.0000	
	Health and Wellness	0.5965		0.0000	
Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization	Involvement	0.8104	Strong Positive Correlation	0.0000	Significant
	Communication	0.7410		0.0000	
	Decision-making	0.8731		0.0000	
	Needs assessment	0.7186		0.0000	
	Support System	0.7218		0.0000	
	Health and Wellness	0.6920	Moderate Positive Correlation	0.0000	

Legend p-value	**Verbal Interpretation**
p-value < 0.05	Significant
p-value ≥ 0.05	Not Significant

Table 14 indicates that there is a significant relationship between the best practices in the dimensions of School-Based Management (SBM) and Stakeholder Engagement, as evidenced by the p-values of 0.0000 across all variables.

Therefore, the findings of this inferential statistics indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected.
This confirms that SBM implementation directly influences stakeholder involvement, communication, decision-making, needs assessment, support systems, and health and wellness in schools. The strength of these relationships varies across different SBM dimensions, ranging from moderate positive correlations to strong positive correlations. This confirmed that SBM implementation directly influenced stakeholder involvement, communication, decision-making, needs assessment, support systems, and health and wellness in schools. The strength of these relationships varied across different SBM dimensions, ranging from moderate positive correlations to strong positive correlations.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

According to Acton (2021), a high-quality planning process was considered essential for supporting a school's improvement efforts. It provided direction for schools, teams, and educators by establishing clear priorities and goals. This structured approach helped focus activities on what mattered most for student success.

By aligning resources with these objectives, schools enhanced their effectiveness. Ultimately, effective planning was vital for driving meaningful improvements in educational outcomes.

Another factor was SMEA (School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment), which provided a structured approach to hold schools accountable for their performance, ensuring that stakeholders, including educators and parents, understood their roles and responsibilities. This was vital for fostering trust and commitment within the school community (Harris & Jones, 2016).

According to Cummings (2024), by incorporating evaluation mechanisms, SMEA allowed schools to make informed decisions based on data and performance metrics.

This led to more effective resource allocation and strategic planning. SMEA emphasized the involvement of various stakeholders in the evaluation process, promoting transparency and collaboration. Engaged stakeholders were more likely to contribute positively to school improvement efforts (Adair & Maughan, 2022).

Table 15. Test of Relationship between the Implementation of the Schools in the Dimensions of School-Based Management and School Performance

School-Based Management	School Performance	R-value	Verbal Interpretation	p-value	Verbal Interpretation
Curriculum and Teaching	OPCRF	-0.3364	Weak Negative Correlation	0.00023	Significant
Learning Environment		-0.3408	Weak Negative Correlation	0.00019	Significant
Leadership		-0.3273	Weak Negative Correlation	0.00031	Significant
Governance and Accountability		-0.3104	Weak Negative Correlation	0.00045	Significant
Human Resource and Team Development		-0.3634	Weak Negative Correlation	0.00012	Significant
Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization		-0.3359	Weak Negative Correlation	0.00021	Significant

Legend

p-value	Verbal Interpretation
p-value < 0.05	Significant
p-value ≥ 0.05	Not Significant

Table 15 indicates the relationship between the best practices in the dimensions of School-Based Management (SBM) and school performance (OPCRF). The findings reveal that all six dimensions of SBM—Curriculum and Teaching, Learning Environment, Leadership, Governance and Accountability, Human Resource and Team Development, and Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization—show a weak negative correlation with school performance, as indicated by the R-values ranging from -0.3104 to -0.3634.

Despite the weak negative correlation, all relationships are found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, the findings of this inferential statistics indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that School-Based Management (SBM) had been effective in enhancing stakeholder engagement and improving school performance. The decentralization of decision-making, autonomy granted to schools, and the active involvement of stakeholders such as parents, teachers, and community members had proven to be crucial components in the successful implementation of SBM. Schools that adopted SBM strategies performed better across various areas, as evidenced by their high OPCRF ratings and improved stakeholder satisfaction.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

However, there were still challenges in fully maximizing the benefits of SBM. Issues such as the redundancy of some indicators, inefficiencies in documentation processes, and inconsistencies in resource allocation needed to be addressed. These challenges, while not undermining the overall success of SBM, highlighted areas where further refinement and support were necessary.

The findings affirmed that SBM had great potential to address local needs, promote educational innovation, and improve school management. Its focus on leadership, resource management, and community involvement fostered an environment conducive to continuous improvement.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

SBM should continue to focus on promoting inclusive education, ensuring that all students, regardless of socio-economic background or disabilities, have access to quality learning experiences. This includes improving facilities to accommodate special needs students, ensuring the equitable distribution of resources, and fostering an inclusive environment where every student has the opportunity to thrive.

SBM implementation should be coupled with an emphasis on fostering innovative teaching methods that engage students and encourage critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving skills. Schools should provide teachers with the training and resources needed to experiment with new teaching strategies and technologies that can enhance the learning experience.

School improvement is a collective effort that requires active community participation. It is essential to strengthen school-community partnerships, where local businesses, organizations, and community members can contribute to the educational process. Schools should actively engage their communities in decision-making, and work to build partnerships that enhance educational opportunities, particularly in areas that are underserved or lacking in resources.

REFERENCES

1. *Adair, J. G., & Maughan, T. (2022). "Equity in Resource Management: Implications for School-Based Management." Educational Research and Evaluation, 28(4), 323-342.*
2. *Avidov-Ungar, O. (2019). "The Role of Community Engagement in Participatory Assessment for SBM: A Case Study." Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 27(56).*
3. *Cabral-Gouveia, C., Menezes, I., & Neves, T. (2023, May). Educational strategies to reduce the achievement gap: a systematic review. In Frontiers in Education (Vol. 8, p. 1155741). Frontiers Media SA.*
4. *Cariaga, R. F. (2023). The Philippine Education Today and its Way Forward. Journal of Ongoing Educational Research, 1(1), 40-41.*
5. *Carvalho, M., Cabral, I., Verdasca, J., & Alves, J. (2022). Strategic action plans for school improvement: An exploratory study about quality indicators for schools' plan evaluation. Journal of Social Studies Education Research, 13(1), 143-163.*
6. *Cruzat, M., Cruzat, A. P., & Javillonar, M. G. (2022). The school and its stakeholders: Partners in building a strong school community. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 3(4), 314-418.*
7. *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 (IMJRISE), 1(3), 79-84.*
8. *Ladd, H. F. (2021). The Impact of School Accountability on Student Outcomes. Harvard Education Press.*
9. *Lubienski, S. T., & Lubienski, C. (2017). "The Role of Accountability in the Improvement of Schools." Educational Policy, 31(3), 279-305.*
10. *Mitchell, R., (2017). Democracy or control? The participation of management, teachers, students and parents in school leadership in Tigray, Ethiopia.*
11. *Int. J. Educ. Dev. 55, 49–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.05.005*
12. *Nguyen, T. S., Mohamed, S., & Panuwatwanich, K. (2018). Stakeholder management in complex project: Review of contemporary literature. Journal of Engineering, Project & Production Management, 8(2).*
13. *Pelayo D. Stakeholders' role in School-Based Management. Sun. Star Pampanga; c2018. Available from: https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/sunstar-pampanga/20180505/281586651225039*
14. *Rahmi, E., Patoni, A., & Sulistyorini, S. (2020). The Management of Human Resources Development in Increasing the Quality of Islamic Education Institutions. Al-Ta Lim Journal, 27(2), 166–178. https://doi.org/10.15548/jt.v27i2.624*
15. *Shepherd, C. (2021). Teacher Led Tier Two Intervention to Increase Student Academic Achievement.*
16. *Tapayan, S. M., Ebio, E. S., & Bentor, M. M. (2016). School-Based Management as Part of Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda. Philippine Journal of Education, 42(1), 45-57.*
17. *Ulfatin, N., Mustiningsih, Sumarsono, R. B., & Yunus, J. N. (2022). School-based management in marginal areas: Satisfying the political context and student needs. Management in Education, 36(3), 124-134.*