

Implementation of School Improvement Plan in Samar and Catbalogan City Divisions

Maria Annabelle D. Daca¹, Lanie M. Pacadaljen²

¹ Education Program Supervisor, Samar Division, Catbalogan City, Philippines

² Associate Professor/Director, Quality Assurance, Samar State University, Catbalogan City, Philippines

Email: ²laniepacadaljen126@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study determined the extent of implementation of School Improvement Plan in Samar and Catbalogan City Divisions in Region VIII, Philippines. In the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP), school-community partnership is substantial considering that when there is a collaborative effort in the school community it results to various opportunities and help ensure the success of plans and activities. The study utilized descriptive-developmental research design to find out the extent of implementation of the SIP that will serve as basis for conceptualizing strategic plan and improvement of school-based management. The researchers employed the Attitude Checklist (AC) contained in the School Based Management Assessment Tool. There were 29 central elementary schools and 29 non-central elementary schools covered in this study representing the Division of Samar and 5 central elementary schools and 5 non-central elementary schools belonging to the Division of Catbalogan City. Results revealed that there was an increase in enrolment, participation rate, cohort survival rate, graduation rate and NAT MPS among respondent-schools before and after the implementation of the SIP. On the other hand, the goals and objectives, performance targets, school improvement process, resource management, school performance accountability, implementation strategies and timelines are moderately implemented by the respondent-schools. All schools are encouraged to organize a committee which would initiate in the framing up of the school improvement plan considering major priorities and resources. School heads may develop plans and strategies to attract stakeholders to extend appropriate financial support and generate income-generating projects to finance the school projects and programs.

Keywords

school improvement plan, stakeholders, resource management, performance targets

Article Received: 10 August 2020, Revised: 25 October 2020, Accepted: 18 November 2020

Introduction

The “No Child Left Behind Act” (NCLB) spurred the education community to turn to research to decide how best to improve schools. Such reliance on research-based approaches helps meet educational leaders and policymakers’ urgency to engage in efforts that will improve the lives of children.

For school and local community officials, however, it is not always clear how best to incorporate research-based approaches into school improvement plans. One obstacle is determining fit. Until recently, some schools and local community officials tend to seek programs that match their own philosophy, paying less attention to how a program addresses school needs or affect student outcomes (Corcoran, 2003). Another is sorting through the research underlying each program. Even when educators and decision makers commit to adopting reform strategies which tract records of effectiveness, they are

challenged to find, interpret, and apply the relevant research (AIR, 2005).

Accordingly, there is a universal belief that the school is the primary institution that caters to productive learning and character formation for children. As such, the school being a learning institution is mandated to perform its two-fold tasks. These are: 1) the task of providing knowledge and honing the skills of its target clientele, and 2) the task of molding the moral fiber of the children by inculcating in them the proper values. In order to carry out this mission the school must be equipped with the necessary resources in fulfilling its function. All schools want their pupils/ students to succeed, however due to some circumstances this vision becomes blurred as lack of resources and poor physical facilities lead or contribute to poor delivery of quality education, especially those schools located in the rural areas such as here in Region VIII. Most of the condition of our school is far from our expectation which is usually a picture unacceptable at the present time. These schools

are characterized with a substandard physical facilities and minimal educational materials for the different learning conditions of the children.

The situation above needs to be studied and carefully thought about not only by the school head but by all major stakeholders using a tool which is called School Improvement Plan. The School Improvement Plan is a five-year development plan which aims to improve both the physical and academic condition of a school. It was conceived as an initiative solution in line with the R.A. 9155 of the Governance of Basic Educational Act of 2002 and the School Based Management Program Thrust of the Department of Education, in which school improvement planning concept was born (DepEd Handbook for the Preparation of the School Improvement Plan, 2006).

School Improvement Plan (SIP) seeks to determine the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the school and formulate solutions to solve the problems of school. The SIP is expected to make lasting difference for change. It involves planning, a major process in which the school set goals for improvement and make decision about how and when these goals will be achieved; and the ultimate objective of the process is to improve the pupils/student performance level by enhancing the curriculum, improving physical facilities and creating a positive environment more conducive for learning. Further, it also fosters and strengthens parents involvement in their children 's learning home.

The purpose of the SIP is to serve as a road map to set out changes to improve the level of achievement of the student/pupils in the academic field. School Improvement Plans help school administrators, teachers, parents and students to know what to focus and what to do in the future. It encourages the teaching staff, parents and other stakeholders known to influence students' success, to have up-to-date and reliable information about the performance of the students considering that the school will be able to respond to the needs of the students if the teachers, parents and other stakeholders have knowledge over this matter. SIP serves as a mechanism in which the public can hold the school accountable for students' success.

It is important that all partners understand this as they enter into the school improvement planning process. Incremental improvements are significant and should be celebrated. As time goes on, school may wish to extend the plan for additional years to ensure that it maintain the focus and reach the goal. In case, school improvement plans should be considered as a working document that the schools should use to monitor progress over time and to make revisions when necessary to ensure that the plans stay on course (Education Improvement Commission, 2000).

In developing school improvement plan, the principal, staff, school council, parents and other community members work through a variety of activities focused on three areas of priority: curriculum delivery, school environment, and parental environment. For each of these areas, the school improvement plan will establish a goal, performance targets, areas of focus, implementation strategies, timelines and persons responsible for implementing the strategies, status updates and opportunities for revision (EIC,ibid).

It is believed that the abovementioned strategic planning is most wanting nowadays to respond to some pressing concerns and/or issues which have been confronting schools both implementing the elementary and secondary education programs. As per experience, these issues predominantly are results of the so-called traditional schools where the school heads were the ones solely responsible in the preparation of school annual implementation plan. Anything that comes out from the mind of the individual school heads becomes the direction of the activities of the school. Some concrete results of such management system are the very low performance indicators of elementary and secondary schools particularly in cohort survival rate, graduation rate, retention rate and dropout rate.

Before the implementation of School Based Management, the said performance indicators of schools got only an average measure of 98.78, 97.33, 96.90, 103.04 and 104.09 for the five-year period from year 2008 to year 2011, respectively. While the new trend in the basic education management is revolutionizing our elementary and secondary schools in responding to school level needs, thus producing increased level of involvement of all education stakeholders, as

reported by barangay and municipal officials in their School Board meetings and even in Education Forum initiated by the Division management.

The implementation of SIP results to various opportunities and help ensure the success of plans and activities. School-community partnership will enable the schools to continuously perform better depending on the ability of the schools to tap and use effectively and efficiently its resources. As stakeholders work together and share the vision and accountability for the learning outcomes of the students to improve teaching-learning process it draws greater support from the community. The interactions between the stakeholders help the school undertake evaluation and determine the problems and the resources needed to improve teaching-learning process in order to formulate improvement plans. Moreover, it also helps continue to reengineer systems and procedures to increase the efficiency of the schools, procurement of goods and services, financial management, management information system and teacher welfare. As such, it is important to know the possible contributions that the school stakeholders will impart in the program of activities that is stipulated in the plan and in a larger sense the possible impact the implementation of the SIP can bring to the development of the stakeholders (DepEd, Primer of School-Community Partnership, 2006).

Objectives

This study determined the extent of implementation of School Improvement Plan in Samar and Catbalogan City Divisions in Region VIII, Philippines.

Specifically, the study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondent-schools before and after the implementation of the SIP in terms of the following performance indicators:
 - 1.1 participation rate;
 - 1.2 cohort survival rate;
 - 1.3 retention rate;
 - 1.4 graduation rate;
 - 1.5 dropout rate, and

1.6 academic achievement (NAT-MPS)?

2. What is the extent of implementation of the School Improvement Plan in relation to:

- 2.1 goal and objectives;
- 2.2 performance targets;
- 2.3 school improvement process;
- 2.4 resource management;
- 2.5 school performance accountability;
- 2.6 implementation strategies, and
- 2.7 timelines?

Review of Related Literature

It has been found out that despite the clear commitment of governments and international agencies to the education sector, efficient and equitable access to education is still proving to be elusive for many people around the world. Girls, indigenous peoples, and other poor and marginalized groups often have only limited access to education. These access issues are being addressed with great commitment in international initiatives, such as Education for All, in which resources are being channeled to low-income countries to help them to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for education.

However, even where children do have access to educational facilities, the quality of education that is provided is often poor. This has become increasingly apparent in international learning tests such as Trends in International Mathematics and Science study (TIMSS), Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) and Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), in which most of the students from developing countries fail to excel. There is evidence that merely increasing resource allocations will not increase the equity or improve the quality of education in the absence of institutional reforms. (Hanushek and Woessmann, 2007).

Governments around the world are introducing a range of strategies aimed at improving the financing and delivery of education services, with a more recent emphasis on improving quality as well as increasing quantity (enrollments) in education. One such strategy is to decentralize education decision-making by increasing parental

and community involvement in schools-which is popularly known as school-based management (SBM). The argument in favor of SBM is that local decentralizing decision-making authority to parents and communities fosters demand and ensures that schools provide the social and economic benefits that best reflect the priorities and values of those communities (Lewis, 2006; and Leithwood and Menzies, 1998).

Education reforms in Organizations for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries tend to share some common characteristics of this kind, including increased school autonomy, greater responsiveness to local needs and the overall objective of improving students' academic performance. Most countries whose students perform well in international student achievement tests give local authorities and schools substantial autonomy to decide the content of their curriculum and the allocation and management of their resources (World Bank, 2007).

An increasing number of developing countries are introducing SBM reforms aimed at empowering principals and teachers or at strengthening their professional motivation, thereby enhancing their sense of ownership of the school. Many of these have also strengthened parental involvement in the schools, sometimes by means of school councils. Almost 11 percent of all projects in the World Bank's education for fiscal years 2006-06 supported school-based management, a total of 17 among about 157 projects. This represents \$1.74 billion or 23 percent of the World Bank's total education financing. The majority of SBM projects in the World Bank's currently portfolio are in Latin American and South Asian countries, including Argentina, Bangladesh, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Mexico and Sri Lanka, in addition, a number of current and upcoming projects in the Africa region have component focused on strengthening school-level committees and SBM. There are also two World Bank-supported SBM projects in Europe and Central Asia (in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and in Serbia and Montenegro) and one each in East Asia and the Pacific (the Philippines) and in the Middle East and North Africa (Lebanon).

On the other hand, Kochan, et al. (2001) cited that leading researchers in the school effectiveness

and education indicator fields have need for process data to lend insights into the schooling process to suggest strategies for improving school performance. The study is focused on the methods piloted during SEAP – II to collect and analyze process data from targeted SEAP schools. In the spring of 1997, approximately 30 LDE staff joined five university-based researchers for intensive two-day site visits to each of the 12 SEAP – II schools in order to collect behavioral and attitudinal data. At each site, a five-member LDE/university team conducted 24 classroom observations, general campus wide observations, a teacher-focus group, student-focus group, and principal interview. Parent, student, teacher and principal surveys also were administered. A variety of univariate statistics and qualitative methods were used to analyze the resulting process data. Process and product data collected during SEAP – II site visits, SEAP – I achievement data, and archival data from other resources for SY 1995 – 1996 through 1997 – 1998, as available. The SEAP teams used established school and teacher effectiveness methods to collect process data of the kind long sought in indicator research. This process data collection effort enabled the SEAP teams to make focused recommendations for school improvement and provided a mechanism for gathering input from students, parents, teachers and administrators. SEAP – II also was an invaluable learning experience for LDE staff, many of whom make administrative and/or policy decisions impacting schools, but spends little time in the field. Because the LDE staff who participated in SEAP – II were drawn from throughout the agency, it also furthered the LDE's planned shift toward a more collaborative and service-oriented relationships with schools.

Moreover, school faculty and administrators developed final school improvement plans, drawing on (a) draft school improvement plans developed by LDE/university staff, which were based on SEAP – I and II findings; and (b) needs assessments (self-studies) conducted by schools themselves. This paper is the perspective of external school improvement experts who helped the 12 schools to identify available strategies and restructuring models (e.g., Accelerated School, Success for All, etc.) that might assist them in their respective school improvement efforts. The

methods section of the paper summarizes the context-specific improvement plants that each school developed for SY 1997 – 1998 to SY 1999 – 2000. Process and product data collected during the course of the SEAP – II site visits, SEAP – I cognitive data, and archival data from other sources. SEAP site teams and external school improvement specialists provided available external perspectives on the strengths and weaknesses of schools and facilitate the delivery of needed resources and services to support school improvement. The SEAP process may even serve as a mechanism for validating the staff's own preconceived needs. Ultimately, however, the direction and the impetus for improvement should come from the school itself, backed by the shared commitment of faculty, administrators, district, and community (Meza and Springfield, 2001).

Pol and Heroman's (2001) emphasized that there is a need to have illustrative case studies of schools that participated in the SEAP pilot. Through narration, with audio-visual support symposium participants walk through several SEAP – II site visits and the LDE's collaborative approach to compiling draft case studies and recommendations. The researcher explains how findings from the SEAP site visits and the schools' own self-assessment were integrated to produce improvement strategies tailored to the specific needs of the individual schools, and described how the respective school's improvement efforts have unfolded.

The few well-documented case of SBM implementation that have been subject to rigorous impact evaluations have already been reviewed elsewhere. The definition of SBM broadly to include community-based management and parental participation schemes but do not explicitly include stand alone, or one off, school grants programs that are not meant to be permanent alterations in school management. SBM programs lie along a continuum in terms of the degree to which decision-making is devolved to the local level. Some devolve only a single area of autonomy, whereas others go further and devolve the power to hire and fire teacher and authority over substantial resources, while at the far end of the spectrum there are those that encourage the private and community management of schools as well as allow parents to create schools. Thus, there are both strong and

weak versions of SBM based on how much decision-making power has been transferred to the school.

The World Bank's World Development Report 2004 (WDR 2004) presented a conceptual framework for SBM. The WDR argues that school autonomy and accountability can help to solve some fundamental problems in education. While increasing resource flows and support to the education sector is one aspect of increasing the access of the poor to better quality education, it is by no means sufficient. The SBM approach aims to provide service delivery to the poor by increasing their choice and participation in service delivery, by giving citizens a voice in school management by making information widely available and by strengthening the incentives for schools to deliver effective services to the poor and by penalizing those who fail to deliver. SBM is the decentralization of authority from the central government to the school level. School-based management can be viewed conceptually as a formal alteration of governance structures, as a form of decentralization that identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement and relies on the redistribution of decision-making authority as the primary means through which improvement might be stimulated and sustained (DepEd, "Primer on School-Based Management Program," 2006).

Thus, in SBM, responsibility for and decision-making authority over, school operations is transferred to principals, teachers and sometimes to students and other school community members. However, these school-level have to conform to or operate within a set of policies determined by the central government. SBM programs exist in many different forms, both in terms of who has the power to make decisions and in terms of the degree of decision-making that is devolved to the school level. While some programs transfer authority only to principals or teachers, others encourage or mandate parental and community participation, often as members of school committees (or school councils or school management committees). In general, SBM programs transfer authority over one or more of the following activities: budget allocation, the hiring and firing of teachers and other school staff, curriculum development, the procurement of textbooks and other educational material,

infrastructure improvements and the monitoring and evaluation of teacher performance and student learning outcomes (DepEd, 2006).

Thus, the theory behind School Based Management is the fostering of school empowerment that it might lead to quality education. Good education is not only about physical inputs, such as classrooms teachers and textbooks, but also about incentives that lead to better instruction and learning. Education systems extremely demanding of the managerial, technical, and financial capacity of governments, and thus, as a service education is too complex to be efficiently produced and distributed in a centralized fashion. The idea behind choice and competition is that parents who are interested in maximizing their children's learning outcomes are able to choose to send their children to the most productive (in terms of academic results) school that they can find. This demand-side pressure on schools will thus improve the performance of all schools if they want to compete for students. Similarly, local decision-making and fiscal decentralization can have positive effects on school outcomes such as test scores or graduation rates by holding the schools accountable for the 'outputs' that it produced.

One of the activities of the School Based Management Program thrust that has been imposed by the Department of Education is the formulation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP), which is a three to five years program of action which embodies the school's mission and vision, and undertaken by the school in order to effect improvement, especially in areas of particular need but also in the school as a whole. It is drawn up in response to findings and recommendations made in its self-evaluation and in the external evaluation. SIP serves to inform and guide the school towards improvement, address the areas of development, enable the school to be more effective learning institution, enhance the accountability of the school to take responsibility and ownership in addressing problem areas and foster collective and cooperative responsibility in regarding educational initiatives (EIC, School Improvement Planning Handbook, 2000).

It is a comprehensive overview of major principles to which school stakeholders will be

dedicated to at least five years. The SIP will describe areas which are needed to be prioritized and for which the school will commit its resources. Activities outlined in an empowerment plan will take the school beyond the maintenance of present strengths towards a more conducive learning. Involved in the formulation of the SIP are the various stakeholders which comprise of all individuals that participates in the improvement of the school, the school administrators, teachers, students, parents, local government units and NGO's etc. with the involvement of the school and the community, the school improvement process will be put in place of systematic method of upgrading the delivery of educational resources at school level. It involves the analysis of the schools priority improvement areas and setting appropriate areas (DepEd SBM Manual, 2002).

Methodology

The study utilized descriptive-developmental research design to find out the extent of implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP) that will serve as basis for conceptualizing strategic plan and improvement of school-based management. The study focused on quantitative research design and analyses on the different indicators considered, using documentary analysis as major tool in gathering data.

The administrators of the elementary schools implementing the SIP, teachers, pupils, and their parents and the organization's stakeholders represented by the student organization, school governing councils, parents association and local government units in Samar and Catbalogan City Divisions implementing the SIP were involved in this study using their assessment results during the initial evaluation of SIP implementation by the Division SBM Task Force of the Division of Samar conducted last summer of School year 2011-2012. Chi-square test, Pearson—product-moment coefficient of correlation, Fisher's t-test, were some of the statistical tools that were used.

The instruments that were utilized included the documents on file at the Department of Education Planning Unit of the Division of Samar consisting of the following: 1) initial assessment results in SIP implementation and SBM practices for CY 2010-2011; 2) profile of schools capturing all performance indicators of all elementary and secondary schools to include the schools of

Catbalogan City, now considered an Interim City Division. Attitude Checklist is contained in the School Based Management Assessment Tool which was utilized in this study to provide inputs after the conduct of the initial assessment of SIP implementation. In addition, SBM Assessment Tool is the primary instrument capturing all the indicators contained in SIP preparation that was utilized by the Division SBM Task Force in evaluating the SIP implementation of all schools. Finally, School Profile is a basic document in the Planning unit of the Division Office of DepEd, Samar Division representing all schools, to include schools in the newly organized City Division of Catbalogan City. This instrument/document is the source of all information translated to the Basic Education Information System (BEIS) accomplished yearly by all school heads agency wide. Specifically, there were 29 central elementary schools and 29 non-central elementary schools covered in this study representing the Division of Samar and 5 central elementary schools and 5 non-central elementary schools belonging to the Division of Catbalogan City that were involved in this study.

Total enumeration was the technique used in identifying the respondent personnel from the respondent schools since they were the ones who were involved in the initial assessment conducted by the members of the Division SBM task Force on how schools implemented their SIP to include schools promising practices that captured the individual involvement of the members of the SGC and /or SPT as well as their attitude towards SIP and its implementation.

More specifically, an outline for a detailed procedure of data gathering and analysis aided the simultaneous nature of the work: 1) coding – organizing and theming data; 2) policing – detecting bias and preventing tangents; 3)

dictating field notes – as opposed to verbatim recordings; 4) connoisseurship – researcher knowledge of issues and context of the site; 5) progressive focusing and funneling – winnowing data and investigative technique as study progresses; 6) memoing – formal noting and sharing of emerging issues; and 7) outlining – standardized writing formats.

Results and Discussion

5.1 Profile of the Respondent-Schools Before and After the Implementation of the SIP

Tables 1 and 7 show the profile of the respondent-schools before and after the implementation of the SIP along the following performance indicators, to wit: 1) enrolment; 2) participation rate; 3) cohort survival rate 4) graduation rate; 5) dropout rate and 6) academic achievement (NAT-MPS).

Enrolment. Table 1 shows the enrolment of the respondent-schools before and after the implementation. It can be observed from the table before the implementation of the SIP, 14 or 20.59 per cent fell the enrolment range of 585-784, 11 or 16.18 percent fell the enrolment range of 385-584, 10 or 14.71 per cent fell the enrolment range of 185-384. The lowest enrolment range fell below 185 where five or 7.35 per cent of the respondent-schools fell with an average of 544 enrollees and a standard deviation of 362 enrollees. Moreover, after the implementation of SIP, the data revealed that 17 respondent-schools fell the enrolment range of 1385 and above, 10 or 14.71 per cent fell the enrolment bracket of 585-784 and 785-984, nine or 13.23 percent fell the enrolment range of 985-1184 and 1185-1384, with a mean of 574 enrollees and a standard deviation of 381 enrollees. Hence, the data show that there was an increase in enrolment among respondent-schools before and after the implementation of SIP.

Table 1: Enrolment of the Respondent-Schools Before and After the Implementation of the SIP

Enrolment	Before (SY 2009-2010)		After (SY 2012-2013)	
	F	Percent	f	Percent
1385 and above	8	11.76	17	25.00
1185 - 1384	9	13.24	9	13.23
985 - 1184	6	8.82	9	13.23
785 - 984	5	7.35	10	14.71
585 - 784	14	20.59	10	14.71
385 - 584	11	16.18	7	10.29

185 - 384	10	14.71	6	8.82
Below 185	5	7.35	0	0.00
Total	68	100.00	68	100.00
Mean	544 enrollees	-	574 enrollees	-
SD	362 enrollees	-	381 enrollees	-

Participation rate. The participation rate of the respondent-schools before and after the implementation of the SIP is shown in Table 2. As revealed in the table, 16 or 23.53 of the respondent-schools fell the participation range of 97-98 percent, eight or 11.76 percent fell between the range of 93-94 and 95-96, six or 8.82 percent fell between the participation ranges of 89-90 and 91-90 before the SIP implementation. The lowest participation rate fell between the bracket of 80 and below where seven or 10.29 percent of the respondent-schools fell, while the highest participation rate fell between the participation

rate range of 99-100 with an average participation rate of 91.51 and a standard deviation of 7.02. On the other hand, after the SIP implementation, majority of the respondent-schools fell the participation rate range of 97-98 where 23 or 33.82 percent fell on the said range. The average participation rate of the respondent-schools was 95.59 with a standard deviation of 5.08. The data show that there was an increase in participation rate of the respondent-schools before and after the implementation of SIP as evidenced by a mean difference of 4.08 percent.

Table 2: Participation Rate of the Respondent-Schools Before and After the Implementation of the SIP

Participation Rate (%)	Before		After	
	f	Percent	f	Percent
99 - 100	4	5.88	17	25.00
97 - 98	16	23.53	23	33.82
95 - 96	8	11.76	7	10.29
93 - 94	8	11.76	8	11.76
91 - 92	6	8.82	3	4.41
89 - 90	6	8.82	1	1.47
87 - 88	5	7.35	2	2.94
85 - 86	4	5.88	4	5.88
83 - 84	1	1.47	2	2.94
81 - 82	3	4.41	1	1.47
80 & below	7	10.29	0	0.00
Total	68	100.00	68	100.00
Mean	91.51	-	95.59	-
SD	7.02	-	5.08	-

Cohort survival rate. The cohort survival rate of the respondent-schools is shown in Table 3. As can be seen from the table, before the implementation of the SIP, 18 or 26.47 percent fell between the range of 84-88 percent, 11 or 16.18 percent fell between the percentage range of 89-93, 10 or 14.71 percent fell between the percentage range of 94-98 percent, followed by nine or 13.24 percent fell the percentage bracket of 74-78 percent. The lowest cohort survival rate is between the percentage bracket of 49-53 with

one or 1.47 percent. Furthermore, it can be observed that none of the respondent-schools fell the cohort survival rate percentage bracket of 103 above with an average of 85.86 percent and standard deviation of 10.21. On the other hand, after the implementation of the SIP, 14 or 20.59 percent fell between the percentage bracket of 84-88 percent, followed by 13 or 19.12 percent fell between the range of 89-93 percent and 94-98 percent, nine or 13.24 percent fell the percentage range of 79-83 percent and 1 or 1.47 fell the

bracket of 49-53 percent with an average of 89.31 percent and standard deviation of 12.61 percent.

This means that majority of the respondent-schools have fair cohort survival rating.

Table 3: Cohort Survival Rate of the Respondent-Schools Before and After the Implementation of the SIP

Cohort Survival Rate (%)	Before		After	
	F	Percent	f	Percent
103 above	0	0.00	2	2.94
99 – 103	6	8.82	7	10.29
94 – 98	10	14.71	13	19.12
89 – 93	11	16.18	13	19.12
84 – 88	18	26.47	14	20.59
79 – 83	7	10.29	9	13.24
74 – 78	9	13.24	7	10.29
69 – 73	0	0.00	0	0.00
64 – 68	5	7.35	0	0.00
59 – 63	1	1.47	2	2.94
54 – 58	0	0.00	0	0.00
49 – 53	1	1.47	1	1.47
Total	68	100.00	68	100.00
Mean	85.86	-	89.31	-
SD	10.21	-	12.61	-

Graduation rate. The graduation rate of the respondent-schools before and after the implementation of the SIP is shown in Table 4. As revealed in the table, the lowest graduation rate of the respondent-schools fell between the graduation range of 81-83 percent while the highest was between the range of 99-100 with about 27 or 39.71 percent. The average graduation rate of the respondent-schools before

implementation was 97.39 with a standard deviation of 3.41. Hence, after the SIP implementation, it was revealed by the same table that The data show that there was an increase in the graduation rate as evidenced by its mean which is 98.45 and a standard deviation of 2.91. In totality, there was an increase of graduation rate among the respondent-schools as evidenced by the mean difference of 1.06 percent.

Table 4: Graduation Rate of the Respondent-Schools Before and After the Implementation of the SIP

Graduation Rate (%)	Before		After	
	f	Percent	f	Percent
99 - 100	27	39.71	39	57.35
97 -98	23	33.82	20	29.41
95 - 96	7	10.29	4	5.88
93 - 94	6	8.82	3	4.41
91 - 92	2	2.94	0	0.00
89 - 90	1	1.47	1	1.47
87 - 88	1	1.47	0	0.00
85 - 86	0	0.00	0	0.00
83 - 84	0	0.00	0	0.00
81 - 82	1	1.47	1	1.47
Total	68	100.00	68	100.00
Mean	97.39	-	98.45	-
SD	3.41	-	2.91	-

Dropout rate. The dropout rate of the respondent-schools before and after the implementation of the SIP is shown in Table 5. As revealed in the table, the highest dropout rate of the respondent-schools fell between the graduation range of 81-83 percent while the highest was between the range of 99-100 with about 27 or 39.71 percent. The average dropout rate of the respondent-schools before implementation was 0.56 with a standard deviation of 1.06. Hence, after the SIP

implementation, it was revealed by the same table that there was an increase in the dropout rate as evidenced by its mean which is 0.65 and a standard deviation of 1.14. In totality, there was an increase of dropout rate among the respondent-schools as evidenced by the mean difference of 1.14 percent this is due to the fact that a lot of families encountered financial constraints and they let their children work with them to earn for a living.

Table 5: Dropout Rate of the Respondent-Schools Before and After the Implementation of the SIP

Dropout Rate (%)	Before		After	
	f	Percent	f	Percent
3.00 & above	1	1.47	1	1.47
2.70 - 2.99	2	2.94	0	0.00
2.40 - 2.69	3	4.41	2	2.94
2.10 - 2.39	1	1.47	5	7.35
1.80 - 2.09	1	1.47	1	1.47
1.50 - 1.79	2	2.94	3	4.41
1.20 - 1.49	3	4.41	2	2.94
0.90 - 1.19	2	2.94	2	2.94
0.60 - 0.89	3	4.41	4	5.88
0.30 - 0.59	6	8.82	10	14.71
0.00 - 0.29	44	64.71	38	55.88
Total	68	100.00	68	100.00
Mean	0.56	-	0.65	-
SD	1.06	-	1.14	-

Academic achievement (NAT-MPS). The NAT-MPS rate of the respondent-schools before and after the implementation of the SIP is shown in Table 6. As revealed in the table, 13 or 17.65 percent fell the MPS range of 83-84, 12 or 17.65 percent fell the MPS range of 75 below, 10 or 14.71 percent fell the range of 75-76, eight or 11.76 percent fell the 87-88 and the rest are thinly distributed to other ranges. The average MPS before the implementation was 79.72 with a standard deviation of 6.65. On the other hand, after the implementation of the SIP, 12 or 17.65 percent fell the MPS range of 83-85 followed by

10 or 14.71 percent which fell the MPS ranges of 85-86 and 89-90, nine or 13.24 percent fell the range of 87-88 and six or 8.82 percent fell the MPS range of 79-80 and 81-82. The average MPS was 84.88 with a standard deviation of 5.00. Noticeably, there was an increase of NAT-MPS from 79.72 percent before the SIP implementation to 84.88 percent after the SIP implementation with a mean difference of 5.16. This connotes that pupils performance on the different learning areas had improved due to intervention activities initiated by the schools with SIP's.

Table 6: NAT MPS of the Respondent-Schools Before and After the Implementation of the SIP

MPS	Before		After	
	f	Percent	f	Percent
93 - 94	0	0.00	2	2.94
91 - 92	0	0.00	4	5.88

89 - 90	0	0.00	10	14.71
87 - 88	8	11.76	9	13.24
85 - 86	7	10.29	10	14.71
83 - 84	13	19.12	12	17.65
81 - 82	6	8.82	6	8.82
79 - 80	7	10.29	6	8.82
77 - 78	5	7.35	4	5.88
75 - 76	10	14.71	3	4.41
75 below	12	17.65	2	2.94
Total	68	100.00	68	100.00
Mean	79.72	-	84.88	-
SD	6.65	-	5.00	-

5.2 Extent of Implementation of the School Improvement Plan

Tables 8-13 show the extent of implementation of the School Improvement Plan for calendar years 2011-2013 along the following: goals and objectives, performance targets, school improvement process, resource management, school performance accountability, implementation strategies and timelines.

Goals and objectives. Table 8 reflects the extent of implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in relation to the goals and objectives. It can

be observed from the table that 39 or 57.35 percent respondent-schools rated fell the score range of 6-10 and was interpreted as “moderately implemented”, 22 or 32.35 percent of the school-respondents were rated “fairly implemented” and 7 or 10.29 percent fell the score range of 11-13 and interpreted as “fully implemented” with an average of 6.28 which means “moderately implemented” with a standard deviation of 2.75. This means that the goals and objectives in the SIP implementation are disseminated to both internal and external stakeholders.

Table 8: Extent of Implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in Relation to the Goals and Objectives

Score	f	Description	Percent
11 – 13	7	Fully Implemented	10.29
6 – 10	39	Moderately Implemented	57.35
1-5	22	Fairly Implemented	32.35
Total	68	-	100.00
Mean	6.28	Moderately Implemented	
SD	2.75	-	

Legend: Level 1 - (Fairly Implemented) Scores from 1 - 5

Level 2 - (Moderately Implemented) Scores from 6 - 10

Level 3 - (Fully Implemented) Scores from 11 - 13

Performance targets. Table 9 shows the extent of implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in relation to the performance targets. As seen from the table, eight or 11.76 percent were assessed Level 1 which means “fairly implemented”, 37 or 54.41 percent of the school-respondents were assessed Level 2 which means “moderately implemented” and the remaining 23 or 33.82 percent were assessed Level 3 which

means “fully implemented”. Hence, the mean was posted at 21.44 which means “moderately implemented” with a standard deviation of 10.36. In totality, SIP implementation was assessed “moderately implemented”.

Table 9: Extent of Implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in Relation to the Performance Targets

Score	f	Description	Percent
39 – 50	23	Level 3 - Fully Implemented	33.82
16 – 38	37	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	54.41
1 – 15	8	Level 1 - Fairly Implemented	11.76
Total	68	-	100.00
Mean	21.44	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	-
SD	10.36	-	-

Legend: Level 1 - (Fairly Implemented) Scores from 1 - 15

Level 2 - (Moderately Implemented) Scores from 16 - 38

Level 3 - (Fully Implemented) Scores from 39 - 50

School improvement process. The extent of implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 in relation to the School Improvement Process was shown in Table 21. As gleaned from the table, 41 or 60.29 percent were assessed level 2 which means “moderately implemented”, 14 or 20.59 percent

were assessed Level 3 which means “fully implemented” and the remaining 13 or 19.12 were assessed Level 1 which means “fairly implemented”. The mean was pegged at 43.72 which was interpreted as “moderately implemented” with a standard deviation of 16.56

Table 10: Extent of Implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in Relation to the School Improvement Process

Score	f	Description	Percent
58 – 82	14	Level 3 - Fully Implemented	20.59
31 – 57	41	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	60.29
1 – 30	13	Level 1 - Fairly Implemented	19.12
Total	68	-	100.00
Mean	43.72	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	-
SD	16.56	-	-

Legend: Level 1 - (Fairly Implemented) Scores from 1 - 30

Level 2 - (Moderately Implemented) Scores from 31 - 57

Level 3 - (Fully Implemented) Scores from 58 - 82

Resource management. Table 11 reflects the extent of implementation of the SIP in relation to the resource management. As observed from the table, 56 or 82.35 were assessed Level 2 which means “moderately implemented”, 11 or 16.18 percent were assessed Level 3 which means “fully implemented” and 1 or 1.47 percent was assessed Level 1 which means “fairly implemented”. The

mean was posted at 12.76 which was assessed Level 2 which means “moderately implemented”. In general, majority of the respondent-schools were assessed “moderately implemented”. Thus, schools should be strengthened in terms of resource management so as to achieve the Level 3 status which means “fully implemented”.

Table 11: Extent of Implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in Relation to the Resource Management

Score	f	Description	Percent
16 - 19	11	Level 3 - Fully Implemented	16.18
8 - 15	56	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	82.35

1 - 7	1	Level 1 - Fairly Implemented	1.47
Total	68	-	100.00
Mean	12.76	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	
SD	2.6	-	

Legend: Level 1 - (Fairly Implemented) Scores from 1 - 7

Level 2 - (Moderately Implemented) Scores from 8 - 15

Level 3 - (Fully Implemented) Scores from 16 - 19

School performance accountability. Table 12 shows the extent of implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in relation to the School Performance Accountability. As gleaned from the table, 33 or 48.53 percent of the school respondents were assessed “moderately implemented” in terms of performance

accountability, 25 or 36.76 percent were assessed “fairly implemented” and 10 or 14.71 percent were “fully implemented” with a mean posted at 25.63 percent and a standard deviation of 8.72. Thus, all schools in City and Samar Divisions must aspire for the full implementation of the SIP in relation to performance accountability.

Table 12: Extent of Implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in Relation to the School Performance Accountability

Score	f	Description	Percent
38 - 56	10	Level 3 - Fully Implemented	14.71
24 - 37	33	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	48.53
1 - 23	25	Level 1 - Fairly Implemented	36.76
Total	68	-	100.00
Mean	25.63	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	
SD	8.72	-	

Legend: Level 1 - (Fairly Implemented) Scores from 1 - 23

Level 2 - (Moderately Implemented) Scores from 24 - 37

Level 3 - (Fully Implemented) Scores from 38 - 56

Implementation strategies. Table 13 shows the extent of implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in relation to the Implementation Strategies. As seen from the table, 41 or 60.29 percent of the respondent-schools have “moderately implemented” the SIP, 20 or 29.41 percent have “fairly implemented” the SIP and 7

or 10.29 percent have full implementation of SIP with a mean pegged at 30.76 which means “moderately implemented” with a standard deviation of 7.94. In general, most schools have moderately implemented the School Improvement Plans.

Table 13: Extent of Implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in Relation to the Implementation Strategies

Score	f	Description	Percent
43 - 60	7	Level 3 - Fully Implemented	10.29
28 - 42	41	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	60.29
1 - 27	20	Level 1 - Fairly Implemented	29.41
Total	68	-	100.00
Mean	30.76	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	
SD	7.94	-	

Legend: Level 1 - (Fairly Implemented) Scores from 1 - 27

Level 2 - (Moderately Implemented) Scores from 28 - 42

Level 3 - (Fully Implemented) Scores from 43 - 60

Timelines. The extent of implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in relation to the timelines is shown in Table 14. As seen from the table, 42 or 61.76 percent have “moderately implemented” the SIP timelines, 25 or 36.76 percent have “fairly implemented” and 1 or 1.47

was “fully implemented” the SIP along its timelines with a mean posted at 6.09 which was interpreted as “moderately implemented” with a standard deviation of 1.57. In general, the extent of implementation along timelines was moderately implemented on those schools with SIPs.

Table 14: Extent of Implementation of the SIP for CY 2011 and 2012 in Relation to the Timelines

Score	f	Description	Percent
11 - 15	1	Level 3 - Fully Implemented	1.47
6 - 10	42	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	61.76
1 - 5	25	Level 1 - Fairly Implemented	36.76
Total	68	-	100.00
Mean	6.09	Level 2 - Moderately Implemented	
SD	1.57	-	

Legend: Level 1 - (Fairly Implemented) Scores from 1 - 5

Level 2 - (Moderately Implemented) Scores from 6 - 10

Level 3 - (Fully Implemented) Scores from 11 - 15

Conclusions and Recommendation

Results revealed that there was an increase in enrolment, participation rate, cohort survival rate, graduation rate and NAT MPS among respondent-schools before and after the implementation of the SIP. This connotes that pupils' performance on the different learning areas had improved due to intervention activities initiated by the schools with SIP's. On the other hand, the goals and objectives, performance targets, school improvement process, resource management, school performance accountability, implementation strategies and timelines are moderately implemented by the respondent-schools. This means that every school was trying their best to disseminate the importance and existence of plans to internal and external stakeholders. Moreover, school heads, teachers, LGU's, parents and pupils are highly involved in the implementation of the SIP. This means that the member-respondents are participative and supportive on the different programs and projects of the schools. However, educational attainment and relevant trainings attended by the school heads affected their extent of implementation of the SIP in relation to its goals and objectives. This means that the higher the educational attainment of school heads and the more experienced they are in the field, the more involved they are in the SIP implementation.

Hence, the extent of involvement of the school heads, teachers, LGU's, parents and pupils shown a favorable attitude towards the DepEd officials in City and Samar Divisions. It is recommended that teachers should be encouraged and trained in the development/ crafting of SIP. Creation of Technical Assistance Committee may be done to undertake monitoring and assessment in program/project implementation which also means that support may be solicited by tapping the expertise of the internal and external stakeholders and careful planning so as to meet the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the school.

Further, implementation of School Improvement Plan should be strengthened to both central and non-central elementary schools in City and Samar Divisions where involvement/participation of stakeholders may be intensified inasmuch as School Improvement Planning is concerned to ensure better performance of schools on the different performance indicators. Likewise, dissemination of students' performance to its stakeholders should be done to provide inputs for future improvement of the plan. All schools may organize the school improvement committee which will initiate in the framing up of the school improvement plan where the major priorities will be treated and given emphasis depending on the

availability of its resources. Also, the school heads may develop plans and strategies to attract stakeholders to extend appropriate financial support and generate income-generating projects to finance the school projects and programs.

References

- [1] American Institutes of Research, 2005.
- [2] Briggs and Wohlstetter (1999). Key Elements of a Successful School-Based Management Strategy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 14(30), 351-372.
- [3] Burden, Joe Jr. W., (May 2007). "Assessing Ethno-relative Pedagogical Preparedness in Pete Programs," Ph. D. Dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.
- [4] Creemers, Bert (2001). "Capacity for change and Adaptation of Schools in the Case of Effective School Improvement," A research project with the final report, "A Framework for Effective School Improvement," completed on July 6, 2001 at the Institute for Educational Research, Gion Westernhaven 15, Groningen, The Netherlands.
- [5] Corcoran, J. Self-Managing School. London: Falmer Press. 2003.
- [6] DepEd, Handbook for the Preparation of the School Improvement Plan, 2006.
- [7] DepEd, Primer on School-Community Partnership, 2006.
- [8] DepEd, Primer on School-Based Management Program, 2006.
- [9] Education Improvement Commission, November 2000.
- [10] EIC, School Improvement Planning Handbook, 2000.
- [11] Hanushek and Woessmann, 2007.
- [12] Khattri, Nidhi, Ling, Cristina and Jha, Shreyasi, (March 2010). "The Effects of School-Based Management in the Philippines: An Initial Assessment Using Administrative Data, Policy Research Working Paper, The World Bank Independent Evaluation Group East Asia Education Sector Unit and Work Bank Institute.
- [13] Kochan, et al, "Gathering and Analyzing Intensive School-Level Process Data – A Review of SEAP-II," The Louisiana School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP), 2001.
- [14] Leithwood and Menzies. (1998). What do we Already know about Successful School Leadership? Prepared for the AERA Division: A task Force on Developing research in Educational Leadership. Retrieved: 5 October 2016 from <http://www.cepa.gse.rutgers.edu>.
- [15] Lewis, J. preparing Students for democratic Citizenship: Codes of Conduction. Victoria's School of the Future. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 5(1), 41-60.
- [16] Meza, James and Sam Stringfield, (2001). "Tying School Improvement to School Accountability: A Review of SEAP-III," The Louisiana School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP).
- [17] Schmoker, Mike. School Improvement Plan in Maryland, 2004.
- [18] Heroman, et al, (2001). "The SEAP Process-Illustrative Case Studies from SEAP-II and III," The Louisiana School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP).
- [19] Jogthong, Chalerm Sri, et al, (2006). "The Development of Teachers' Potential in Teaching English for Level 1 and Level 2 Students in Partnership Schools for Teacher Professional Development by Implementing Participatory Action Research Process," Unpublished dissertation, Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat University, Thailand.
- [20] Kennedy, Eugene, Mandeville, Garrett and Crone, Linda, (2001). "Analyzing Statewide School Effectiveness Datasets Accurately and Fairly – A Review of SEAP-I," Integrating School Indicators, School Effectiveness, and School Improvement Research – The Louisiana School Effectiveness and Assistance Program (SEAP).
- [21] Pimolbunyong, Rosarin, et al, (2004). "The Development of Teachers and Schools for Cooperative Teacher Professional Development," Unpublished dissertation, Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat University, Thailand.
- [22] Reynolds, David and Charles Teddlie, (2001). "Joining School Indicator, School Effectiveness, and School Improvement Research – The International Perspective,"

Integrating School Indicators, School Effectiveness and School Improvement Research – The Louisiana School Effectiveness Assistance Program (SEAP).

- [23] World Bank, “What is School-Based Management,” November 2007.
- [24] Yap, Ingrid R. and Adorio, Mercedes P., (December 2008). “School-Based Management: Promoting Special Education Programs in Local Schools,” Unpublished dissertation, U. P. College of Education.