

The implementation of school-based management through the lens of the administrative officers

Janine A. Cusip *

Apayao State College, Malama, Conner, Apayao Philippines 3807.

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2026, 19(02), 1237-1246

Publication history: Received on 08 April 2026; revised on 16 May 2026; accepted on 18 May 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijrsra.2026.19.2.1140>

Abstract

This study examined how administrative officers in Districts I and II of Kabugao, Apayao perceived School-Based Management (SBM) implementation in their schools. Specifically, it described the demographic profile of the officers, assessed their perceived level of SBM implementation across four domains, and tested whether perceived implementation levels differed significantly by sex, age group, educational attainment, and professional development. All 34 administrative officers in both districts participated in the study. The sample was predominantly female (91.18%), young (mean age 30.68), uniformly positioned at the 1–5 year service range, largely holding only a Bachelor's degree (85.29%), and mostly without relevant professional development training (79.41%). Respondents rated SBM implementation at the quality standard level across all four domains, with an overall mean of 2.85 (SD = 0.26) on DepEd's 0–3 scale. Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Management of Resources recorded the highest domain means (M = 2.89 each), while Curriculum and Learning recorded the lowest (M = 2.76). The SIP monitoring indicator received a perfect score of 3.00, whereas accessibility of learning materials and resources was the weakest item across all domains (M = 2.59, SD = 0.61). Significance testing showed that perceived SBM level differed significantly by sex and by age group. Female respondents rated implementation consistently higher than their male counterparts across all domains, though the male subsample was very small (n = 3). Mid-career officers aged 31–35 reported the highest means, while the 36–40 group reported the lowest. No significant differences were found by educational attainment or professional development, results most plausibly attributed to insufficient statistical power given the small and unequal subgroup sizes. The findings suggest that SBM implementation in this remote district context meets procedural standards but may be constrained by limited access to training, advanced credentials, and instructional materials. Self-report data introduced the possibility of positivity bias and results should be interpreted accordingly.

Keywords: School-Based Management; Administrative Officers; DepEd; Kabugao Apayao; SBM Implementation; Geographically Isolated Schools

1. Introduction

In the global basic education system, administrative personnel and other non-teaching staff are recognized as vital contributors to the effective functioning of schools. Across various countries, these personnel ensure the smooth implementation of school operations by managing records, finances, logistics, and coordination of school activities functions that allow school leaders and teachers to concentrate on instructional leadership and classroom teaching. International studies emphasize that strong administrative support systems are closely linked to improved school accountability [1,2].

Administrative officers perform a wide range of responsibilities that support the overall management of schools. Their roles include records management, budget preparation and financial processing, procurement and resource management, preparation of official reports, coordination of school programs and activities, and facilitation of

* Corresponding author: Janine A. Cusip

communication between school personnel and external stakeholders. Through these functions, administrative officers help maintain organized school operations, ensure compliance with government regulations, and support the implementation of school policies and programs. Their performance directly contributes to the effectiveness of school management and the successful implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) by ensuring that administrative processes are efficient, transparent, and responsive to the needs of the school community [3,4].

School-Based Management (SBM) has been widely recognized as an approach that decentralizes decision-making authority and empowers schools to manage their own resources, programs, and operations in collaboration with stakeholders. Globally, SBM has been associated with improved accountability, participatory governance, school effectiveness, and educational outcomes because it encourages shared leadership and community involvement in school management [1,2]. Effective implementation of SBM requires not only strong instructional leadership from school heads but also efficient administrative support systems that facilitate planning, budgeting, monitoring, reporting, and coordination of school activities.

In the Philippine basic education system, administrative personnel and other non-teaching staff play a crucial role in ensuring the efficient operation of schools. These personnel perform essential functions such as records management, financial processing, coordination of school activities, and administrative support that enable school heads and teachers to focus on instructional leadership and teaching responsibilities [5,6]. Moreover, the Department of Education continues to strengthen the implementation of School-Based Management as a governance framework that promotes decentralization, shared accountability, and stakeholder participation in schools.

Recent policy developments in the Philippines underscore the government's commitment to strengthening administrative support in public schools. The Department of Education issued DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024, which mandates the immediate removal of administrative tasks from public school teachers to allow them to focus on instruction. In line with this directive, the government approved the creation of 5,000 non-teaching plantilla positions, including 3,500 Administrative Officer II positions and 1,500 Project Development Officer I position. Additionally, in March 2025, DepEd announced the hiring of 7,062 school-based administrative support staff under contract of service, funded through the Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE), to further operationalize the removal of non-instructional duties from teachers (Department of Education, 2024) [7,8]. These reforms highlight the increasing recognition of administrative officers as essential partners in strengthening school governance and supporting the effective implementation of SBM.

Furthermore, DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2023, which provides updated guidelines on recruitment, selection, and appointment (RSA), institutionalized a merit-based system for hiring both teaching and non-teaching personnel. This policy strengthens transparency, professionalism, and accountability in school staffing [5,6]. Such initiatives emphasize the importance of competent administrative officers in ensuring efficient school operations and effective governance practices aligned with SBM principles.

Despite these policy reforms and the growing recognition of the role of administrative personnel in schools, limited studies have specifically examined the performance of administrative officers in relation to the implementation of School-Based Management, particularly within local district contexts. Most existing studies focus primarily on teaching performance, instructional leadership, or school heads, while the contribution of administrative officers to SBM implementation and school governance remains relatively underexplored [4,9].

In the schools under Districts I and II of Kabugao, administrative officers play an important role in supporting school operations and facilitating the implementation of School-Based Management. Their work contributes to efficient administrative processes, proper resource utilization, transparent financial management, timely reporting, and effective coordination of programs and activities. These functions support key SBM dimensions such as leadership and governance, curriculum and learning support, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources. Through their administrative functions, administrative officers help schools achieve organizational efficiency and strengthen participatory governance practices.

Given these considerations, it is essential to assess the performance of administrative officers in Districts I and II of Kabugao and examine how they implement School-Based Management through their administrative functions and responsibilities. Specifically, this study seeks to explore the implementation of SBM through the lens of administrative officers and determine how their performance contributes to effective school governance and management.

The researcher, being an administrative officer in Kabugao, is motivated to examine the performance of administrative officers and their role in the implementation of School-Based Management. The findings of this study may serve as a

basis for recommending enhancement programs and policy interventions that will strengthen administrative performance and support effective SBM implementation in schools.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design to assess the profile of the respondents, as well as the perceived level of implementation of School-Based Management (SBM).

2.2. Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in all schools of Kabugao District I and II, apayao under the Cordillera Administrative Region.

2.3. Participants of the Study

The respondents of the study included all administrative officers of Kabugao Districts I and II. A total of 34 Administrative Officers of Kabugao District I and II were involved. The respondents were chosen through purposive sampling, ensuring that respondents were directly involved in school management and School-Based Management activities.

2.4. Research Instrument

The study utilized a structured questionnaire based on the Department of Education (DepEd) School-Based Management (SBM) framework to gather data on the performance of administrative officers in Districts I and II of Kabugao. The instrument consisted of three parts: Part I: Demographic Profile – Includes information on respondents' length of service, professional development and training. Part II: School-Based Management Questionnaire – Measures the level of implementation of School-Based Management in schools based on the DepEd SBM Assessment Domains. The instrument provides quantitative data that can be analyzed using descriptive statistics such as (mean, frequency, and percentage).

2.5. Statistical Analysis

The study utilized frequency and percentage to describe the profile of the respondents, while the weighted mean was used to determine the perceived level of implementation of the School-Based Management (SBM). T-test (for 2 groups) and ANOVA/Kruskal-Wallis H (3 or more groups) were used to assess if there is a significant difference on the implementation of SBM as perceived by the administrative officers.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Profile of the Administrative Officers

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 34 administrative officers in Districts I and II of Kabugao, Apayao, described according to age, sex, educational attainment, length of service, and professional development.

Table 1 Profile of Administrative Officers in Districts I and II of Kabugao, Apayao

Profile Variable	Category	f	%
Age	26 -30 years old	20	58.82
	31 -35 years old	8	23.53
	36 -40 years old	6	17.65
	Total	34	100.00
Sex	Male	3	8.82
	Female	31	91.18
	Total	34	100.00

Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree	29	85.29
	Master's Degree	4	11.76
	Doctorate	1	2.94
	Total	34	100.00
Length of Service	1 -5 years	34	100.00
	Total	34	100.00
Professional Development	None	27	79.41
	1 -2 trainings	3	8.82
	3 -4 trainings	4	11.76
	Total	34	100.00

3.2. Age

The majority of respondents (n = 20, 58.82%) fell within the 26 -30 age bracket, followed by the 31 -35 group (n = 8, 23.53%), and the 36 -40 group (n = 6, 17.65%). The mean age was 30.68 (SD = 4.17). This distribution indicates that most of the administrative officers in both districts are in the early to middle stages of their administrative careers. This is consistent with the broader workforce pattern in Philippine basic education, where positions at the school level are frequently occupied by younger professionals, many of whom are still building their administrative competencies.[4] Mendoza and Bautista observed that administrators in remote communities in the Philippines tend to be younger and with fewer years of experience compared to their urban counterparts, which may reflect both recruitment realities and limited career pathways in geographically isolated divisions.[4]

3.3. Sex

Female respondents comprised the large majority of the sample (n = 31, 91.18%), with only three males (8.82%). This distribution parallels the well-documented feminization of the teaching and school-level administrative workforce in Philippine public schools.[3] Llagas and Bernardo noted that female teachers and administrators dominate the workforce in public elementary schools, particularly in provinces, a trend attributed to both historical patterns and the perceived social fit of women in educational nurturing roles.[3] The gender composition of the current sample reflects this systemic pattern and must be considered when interpreting sex-disaggregated comparisons, given that the extremely small male subsample limits the scope of inference.

3.4. Educational Attainment

Most respondents held a Bachelor's degree (n = 29, 85.29%), four had completed a Master's degree (11.76%), and one held a doctorate (2.94%). The low proportion of graduate degree holders may reflect limited access to advanced academic programs in remote areas of Apayao, rather than a lack of professional aspiration among the officers. This finding aligns with those of Mendoza and Bautista,[4] who documented structural barriers to postgraduate education among school administrators in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas (GIDAs) in Northern Luzon, including financial constraints, distance from universities, and the demands of full-time service. Bautista similarly noted that the uneven educational profile of school administrators in provincial divisions reflects systemic access inequalities rather than individual disengagement.[5]

3.5. Length of Service

All 34 respondents (100%) reported a length of service within the 1 -5 year category. Because the variable produced no variance across the sample, it could not function as a differentiating variable in comparative analyses and was excluded from significance testing. This uniformity may itself be informative: the concentration of officers within an early service range suggests either recent staffing of administrative positions in both districts or a pattern of turnover that keeps the workforce relatively new. Bautista noted that staff turnover in remote Philippine schools is structurally linked to limited career incentives and deployment policies, which may account for the relative youth and short service tenure of this group.[5]

3.6. Professional Development

Twenty-seven respondents (79.41%) reported attending no relevant professional development trainings, while three (8.82%) attended 1 -2 trainings and four (11.76%) attended 3 -4 trainings. This high proportion of officers without formal training exposure is a notable finding. Professional development is widely associated with improved school management capacity and the quality of SBM implementation.[2] Malaluan, Bautista, and Pascual found that administrative capacity in Philippine public schools measured partly through training participation was a significant predictor of SBM quality ratings, particularly in the governance and accountability domains.[2] The near-absence of training among most respondents in this study may represent a structural gap that warrants attention in divisional planning, particularly given the known association between professional preparation and effective governance.[8]

3.7. Level of the Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) as Perceived by Administrative Officers

Tables 2 through 5 present the mean scores and standard deviations for each SBM indicator across four domains: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Learning, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Management of Resources. Scores were interpreted using the DepEd SBM scale (0 -3), in which a mean of 2.50 -3.00 indicates that practices satisfy quality standards. Table 6 consolidates the domain means for cross-domain comparison.

Table 2 Level of SBM Implementation in Leadership and Governance

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
The school head leads stakeholders in setting the school's vision, mission, and goals.	2.91	0.29	Quality Standard
School leaders encourage participation of teachers, parents, and community members in decision-making.	2.91	0.29	Quality Standard
The school has a functional School Governing Council or similar body.	2.88	0.33	Quality Standard
Policies and programs are communicated clearly to stakeholders.	2.79	0.41	Quality Standard
Domain Mean	2.88	0.29	Quality Standard

All four indicators in the Leadership and Governance domain were rated at the quality standard level, yielding a domain mean of 2.88 (SD = 0.29). The two highest-rated items were the school head's role in setting the vision, mission, and goals (M = 2.91) and encouraging stakeholder participation in decision-making (M = 2.91). These results are consistent with findings from Dumlao and Malaluan,[1] who reported that school governing councils in decentralized Philippine schools tend to function most visibly in goal-setting and governance participation activities, which school heads typically lead directly. The item on clear communication of policies and programs received the lowest rating in this domain (M = 2.79, SD = 0.41), and the higher standard deviation suggests uneven practices across schools. Lucas and Ocampo similarly noted that communication between school administrators and stakeholders is among the more variable dimensions of SBM implementation, especially in schools serving geographically dispersed communities.[6]

Table 3 Level of SBM Implementation in Curriculum and Learning

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Teachers use learner-centered teaching strategies.	2.88	0.33	Quality Standard
The curriculum is contextualized to meet the needs of the learners and community.	2.79	0.41	Quality Standard
Learning materials and resources are accessible to students.	2.59	0.61	Quality Standard
The school monitors learners' performance regularly.	2.76	0.43	Quality Standard
Domain Mean	2.76	0.30	Quality Standard

The Curriculum and Learning domain recorded the lowest domain mean among the four ($M = 2.76$, $SD = 0.30$), though still within the quality standard range. The most notable finding within this domain is the comparatively lower score on the accessibility of learning materials and resources ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 0.61$). The higher standard deviation on this item suggests considerable variability in respondents' assessments across schools, which may reflect uneven resource distribution within the two districts. This pattern parallels findings by Malaluan, Bautista, and Pascual,[2] who documented that resource provision particularly instructional materials was among the most inconsistently implemented SBM components in Philippine public schools, especially in divisions with limited fiscal resources. Lucas and Ocampo [6] further noted that the equity dimension of SBM, including equitable access to learning resources, remains a persistent challenge in provincial schools, where centralized procurement and delivery systems do not always align with school-level needs.

Table 4 Level of SBM Implementation: Accountability and Continuous Improvement

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
The school regularly reviews its performance and programs.	2.88	0.33	Quality Standard
Stakeholders are informed about school achievements and challenges.	2.82	0.39	Quality Standard
The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is regularly monitored and updated.	3.00	0.00	Quality Standard
The school practices transparency in reporting outcomes.	2.85	0.36	Quality Standard
Domain Mean	2.89	0.21	Quality Standard

The Accountability and Continuous Improvement domain recorded a domain mean of 2.89 ($SD = 0.21$), tied for the highest among the four domains. One item-regular monitoring and updating of the School Improvement Plan received a perfect mean score of 3.00 ($SD = 0.00$), indicating unanimous agreement among all 34 respondents. This finding suggests that SIP monitoring is consistently carried out across schools in both districts, likely reflecting strong compliance with DepEd policy directives. The SIP is a mandated planning instrument under DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015,[7] and its near-universal implementation at the quality standard level indicates that structural compliance requirements are being met. Bautista noted that SIP-related practices tend to be among the more uniformly implemented SBM components because they are subject to direct divisional monitoring and reporting requirements, which creates a strong incentive for compliance.[5]

Table 5 Level of SBM Implementation: Management of Resources

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
The school effectively manages financial resources.	2.94	0.24	Quality Standard
Facilities and equipment are properly maintained.	2.88	0.48	Quality Standard
The school mobilizes community resources to support programs.	2.82	0.39	Quality Standard
Resources are allocated based on school priorities.	2.91	0.29	Quality Standard
Domain Mean	2.89	0.31	Quality Standard

The Management of Resources domain tied with Accountability and Continuous Improvement for the highest domain mean ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 0.31$). Financial management received the highest score within this domain ($M = 2.94$, $SD = 0.24$), followed by resource allocation based on school priorities ($M = 2.91$). Facilities maintenance ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 0.48$) showed the widest spread of ratings, which may reflect variability in infrastructure conditions across schools in the two districts. Llagas and Bernardo observed that school climate an outcome partly dependent on resource management was positively associated with administrative support and adequate facilities in Philippine public schools, suggesting that gaps in this indicator may have downstream effects on the learning environment.[3] Dumlao and Malaluan[1] further noted that the mobilization of community resources, which received the lowest score in this domain ($M = 2.82$), is contingent on the strength of the school's external relationships, a dimension that tends to be more developed in schools with longer-tenured and more experienced administrators.

Table 6 Summary of SBM Domain Means

Domain	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Leadership and Governance	2.88	0.29	Quality Standard
Curriculum and Learning	2.76	0.30	Quality Standard
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	2.89	0.21	Quality Standard
Management of Resources	2.89	0.31	Quality Standard
Overall	2.85	0.26	Quality Standard

Across all four domains, administrative officers rated SBM implementation at the quality standard level (domain mean range: 2.76 -2.89), with an overall mean of 2.85 (SD = 0.26). The Curriculum and Learning domain recorded the lowest mean (M = 2.76), while Accountability and Continuous Improvement and Management of Resources tied for the highest (M = 2.89 each). These results indicate that, as perceived by the respondents, SBM practices in Districts I and II of Kabugao meet the standards defined in DepEd's SBM assessment framework across all dimensions. This overall picture is broadly consistent with national-level findings. Malaluan, Bautista, and Pascual,[2] in their analysis of SBM implementation across Philippine public schools, found that governance and accountability domains tended to score highest, while curriculum-related domains showed more variability which is a pattern that the current results partly replicate. The relatively stronger performance in accountability and resource management may reflect the influence of structured compliance mechanisms such as SIP monitoring, performance reviews, and financial reporting requirements that DepEd mandates across all divisions.[7,8]

3.8. Significant Differences in the Perceived Level of SBM Implementation by Profile Variables

This section examines whether the perceived level of SBM implementation differs significantly across profile subgroups. Because all respondents share the same administrative position and the same length of service category (1 -5 years), significance testing was applied to the remaining four variables: sex, age group, educational attainment, and professional development. An independent-samples t-test was used for sex; one-way ANOVA was applied to age group and educational attainment; and the Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for professional development given the small and unequal subgroup sizes. The alpha level was set at 0.05.

3.8.1. By Sex

Table 7 Differences in Perceived SBM Level by Sex

Domain	Male M (n=3)	SD	Female M (n=31)	SD	t	p	Decision
Leadership & Governance	2.33	0.58	2.93	0.20	-4.125	0.0002	Reject Ho
Curriculum & Learning	2.17	0.72	2.81	0.16	-4.533	0.0001	Reject Ho
Accountability & CI	2.50	0.00	2.93	0.09	-4.217	0.0002	Reject Ho
Management of Resources	2.17	0.72	2.96	0.11	-6.207	<0.0001	Reject Ho
Overall SBM	2.29	0.61	2.91	0.12	-5.334	<0.0001	Reject Ho

Statistically significant differences were found across all SBM domains when comparing male and female respondents. Female respondents rated implementation consistently higher on every domain and in the overall score. The largest difference appeared in Management of Resources (Female M = 2.96 vs. Male M = 2.17; $t = -6.207$, $p < 0.0001$), and the overall SBM comparison also showed a substantial gap ($t = -5.334$, $p < 0.0001$). These results indicate that sex is associated with differences in perceived SBM implementation in this sample. This finding partially parallels observations by Llagas and Bernardo,[3] who found that female administrators in Philippine public elementary schools tended to report more favorable assessments of school governance and management outcomes than their male counterparts. One plausible explanation is that female officers, who dominate the administrative workforce and are more deeply embedded in day-to-day school processes, may have greater familiarity with and confidence in SBM-related practices, which could shape how they evaluate implementation quality.

However, the male subsample in the current study is very small ($n = 3$), and this considerably limits the generalizability of the findings. The observed group differences may partly reflect individual variation rather than a consistent pattern attributable to sex alone. These results should therefore be interpreted with caution, and replication with a larger and more balanced sample is needed before substantive conclusions can be drawn.

3.8.2. By Age Group

Table 8 Differences in Perceived SBM Level by Age Group

Domain	26 -30 M (n=20)	31 -35 M (n=8)	36 -40 M (n=6)	F	p	Sig?	Decision
Leadership & Governance	2.95	2.97	2.50	9.068	0.0008	Yes	Reject Ho
Curriculum & Learning	2.79	2.91	2.46	5.149	0.0117	Yes	Reject Ho
Accountability & CI	2.91	3.00	2.67	6.342	0.0049	Yes	Reject Ho
Management of Resources	2.96	3.00	2.50	8.492	0.0011	Yes	Reject Ho
Overall SBM	2.90	2.97	2.53	8.477	0.0012	Yes	Reject Ho

Significant differences by age group were found across all SBM domains and in the overall score (Overall $F[2, 31] = 8.477$, $p = 0.0012$). The 31 -35 age group reported the highest domain means across all indicators (Overall $M = 2.97$), followed by the 26 -30 group (Overall $M = 2.90$). The 36 -40 group recorded the lowest overall mean ($M = 2.53$), though this still falls within the quality standard range. Officers in the 31 -35 bracket may occupy a position where accumulated practical experience and continued close engagement with day-to-day school operations together produce more affirmative assessments of SBM functioning. The comparatively lower ratings among the 36 -40 group may reflect a more evaluative orientation shaped by longer institutional exposure, where respondents are more attuned to gaps and implementation inconsistencies.

This pattern is somewhat consistent with developmental perspectives on professional behavior in educational contexts, where mid-career administrators who have gained functional competence but have not yet moved into more detached senior oversight roles tend to report higher confidence in institutional processes.[4] However, the small group sizes across age categories, particularly the 36 -40 bracket ($n = 6$), limit the strength of inference that can be drawn from these results. Post-hoc testing to identify specific pairwise differences was not reported in the original analysis and would be necessary to support more precise conclusions about which age groups differ from one another.

3.8.3. By Educational Attainment

Table 9 Differences in Perceived SBM Level by Educational Attainment

Domain	Bachelor's M (n=29)	Master's M (n=4)	Doctorate M (n=1)	F	p	Sig?	Decision
Leadership & Governance	2.90	2.81	3.00	0.528	0.5951	No	Accept Ho
Curriculum & Learning	2.76	2.69	3.00	0.339	0.7151	No	Accept Ho
Accountability & CI	2.89	2.88	3.00	0.147	0.8641	No	Accept Ho
Management of Resources	2.89	2.88	3.00	0.359	0.7011	No	Accept Ho
Overall SBM	2.86	2.81	3.00	0.301	0.7424	No	Accept Ho

No statistically significant differences were found in any SBM domain when respondents were grouped by educational attainment. F-values were low (range: 0.147 -0.528) and all p-values exceeded 0.05. Mean scores were closely clustered across the Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctorate subgroups. This finding suggests that, within this sample, the level of formal educational credential does not differentiate how administrative officers perceive SBM implementation. This result may not be altogether surprising given that SBM competencies in the Philippine context are shaped more directly by on-the-job training, divisional support, and compliance systems than by graduate-level academic preparation alone.[5,8]

The result should, however, be interpreted with caution. The Doctorate subgroup comprised only one respondent, which makes cross-group comparison analytically uninformative for that category. The unequal and small subgroup sizes across all three credential levels substantially reduce the statistical power available to detect differences, even moderate ones. Future research with larger and more balanced samples is needed to test whether educational attainment has a measurable association with SBM perceptions in this context.

3.8.4. By Professional Development

Table 10 Differences in Perceived SBM Level by Professional Development

Domain	None M (n=27)	1 -2 M (n=3)	3 -4 M (n=4)	H	p	Sig?	Decision
Leadership & Governance	2.88	2.83	2.94	1.568	0.4566	No	Accept Ho
Curriculum & Learning	2.76	2.63	2.81	0.901	0.6374	No	Accept Ho
Accountability & CI	2.85	3.00	2.94	3.434	0.1796	No	Accept Ho
Management of Resources	2.90	2.83	2.88	0.743	0.6898	No	Accept Ho
Overall SBM	2.85	2.82	2.89	1.643	0.4398	No	Accept Ho

No statistically significant differences were found across professional development categories in any SBM domain. H-values ranged from 0.743 to 3.434, and all p-values exceeded 0.05. The group with no training exposure (n = 27) reported mean scores comparable to those who had attended 1 -4 trainings, with a maximum difference of 0.17 percentage points in the Accountability and Continuous Improvement domain. This result appears to contrast with the broader literature, which generally associates professional development participation with higher perceptions of administrative effectiveness.[2,8] Malaluan, Bautista, and Pascual reported that training participation was positively associated with SBM quality ratings in a national sample of Philippine public schools,[2] while the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) explicitly links continuing professional development to improved school leadership and governance performance.[8]

The absence of a significant relationship in the current study may be attributable to statistical rather than substantive reasons. The trained subgroups were very small (n = 3 and n = 4), which considerably reduces the power to detect differences of the magnitude typically reported in prior studies. Additionally, the measure of professional development used here a count of trainings attended does not capture the content, quality, or relevance of the training, which are factors that may matter more than frequency alone. These findings should therefore not be interpreted as evidence that professional development has no effect on SBM practices; rather, the current data are insufficient to test that relationship adequately. Studies with larger samples and more refined measures of training exposure are needed to draw reliable conclusions on this variable.

4. Conclusion

School-Based Management in Kabugao Districts I and II was perceived to meet quality standards, with strengths in SIP monitoring and financial management. Weaker areas include resource accessibility and community mobilization, reflecting structural limits of a remote setting. Differences by sex and age appeared but were constrained by small group sizes, while educational attainment and professional development showed no effects. Overall, School-Based Management (SBM) is viewed positively, though outcomes are shaped by limited training, credentials, and resources, with possible positivity bias in self-reports.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge that I have not used ChatGPT or copilot for refining some of the sections in the document.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

Authors have declared that this manuscript has no competing interests.

Statement of ethical approval

The study was conducted with approval and in accordance with the standards of the college. No ethical approval was required, as the research followed all applicable ethical guidelines, ensuring respect for the respondents' privacy and confidentiality.

Statement of informed consent

I affirm that the respondents voluntarily agreed to participate after being fully informed about the purpose, nature, and potential implications of the study. Their responses have been collected with utmost respect for their privacy and confidentiality, in accordance with ethical research guidelines.

References

- [1] Dumlao RD, Malaluan NL. Decentralization and school governance in the Philippines: The role of the school governing council. *J Sch Leadersh*. 2020;30(4):387–412. doi:10.1177/1052684620925621
- [2] Malaluan NL, Bautista BO, Pascual MRS. School-based management and school effectiveness: Evidence from Philippine public schools. *Int J Educ Dev*. 2019;69:102085. doi:10.1016/j.ijeducdev.2019.102085
- [3] Llagas CA, Bernardo MJB. Teacher competence and school climate as predictors of school efficiency in public elementary schools in the Philippines. *Philipp Educ Res J*. 2017;16(1):23–40. doi:10.5281/zenodo.1008542
- [4] Mendoza RU, Bautista MCS. Equity and access in Philippine basic education: The role of school administrators in remote communities. *Educ Manag Adm Leadersh*. 2022;50(1):152–169. doi:10.1177/1741143220968035
- [5] Bautista BO. School-based management in the Philippines: Evolution, implementation, and challenges. *Kasetsart J Soc Sci*. 2015;36(3):355–362. doi:10.1016/j.kjss.2015.06.002
- [6] Lucas ML, Ocampo MDA. School-based management and educational equity: A Philippine perspective. *J Educ Plan Adm*. 2019;33(4):401–416. doi:10.1177/0972654319867201
- [7] Department of Education. The enhanced school improvement planning (SIP) process guide. 2014. Available from: https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/DO_42_s2014.pdf
- [8] Department of Education. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). 2016. Available from: <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/PPSSH.pdf>
- [9] Kadton ML, Navarro-Parcon M, Basar-Monir L. School-based management in the operations and performance of public elementary schools. *SSRN Electron J*. 2016. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3139808
- [10] Patiam AMC. Evaluation of contextualized SBM practices in selected public elementary schools in the Philippines. *Educ Process Int J*. 2025. doi:10.22521/edupij.2025.18.514
- [11] Pham KT, Ha XV, Truong TD, Dinh HVT, Duong HYT, Nguyen TV. School stakeholders' perspectives on school-based management in Vietnam's education reform. *Eur J Educ*. 2025. doi:10.1111/ejed.70193
- [12] Caldwell BJ. School-based management. UNESCO IIEP Education Policy Series No. 3. Paris: UNESCO; 2005. Available from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001410/141025e.pdf>
- [13] Bandur A. School-based management developments: Challenges and impacts. *J Educ Adm*. 2012;50(6):845–873. doi:10.1108/09578231211264711
- [14] Republic of the Philippines. Republic Act No. 9155: Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. 2001.
- [15] Department of Education. DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012: Implementing guidelines on the revised SBM framework.
- [16] Department of Education. DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024: Policy guidelines on the revised SBM system.
- [17] Hilario JT, Quinito DI. Administrative Officer II: Its implementation and participation in enhancing school operational efficiency and educational leadership. *Int J Res Innov Soc Sci*. 2026;10(1). doi:10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10100288
- [18] Department of Education. DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024: Policy on removal of administrative tasks from teachers.
- [19] Department of Education. Hiring of non-teaching personnel under MOOE funding initiative. 2025.