Enhancing the Leadership Performance of School Heads in Implementing School-based Management by Strategic Planning for School Improvement

Tarhata S. Guiamalon
Cotabato State University (CSU)
Sinsuat Avenue, Cotabato City, Philippines

Abstract
This research examines the school heads' managerial performance concerning the school improvement planning (SIP) and leadership in the context of school-based management (SBM) for the Divisions of Maguindanao II and Cotabato City under the Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education (MBHTE) of Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM). Effective leadership within an institution facilitates both SIP and SBM. Using a descriptive correlational survey approach, data was gathered from 148 teachers across selected public elementary schools. Results indicate that school heads' managerial performance significantly affects SIP, which is a prerequisite for effective SBM. Student achievement necessitates contextualized clear vision and community participation along with commitment tailored to each individual school's needs. The findings suggest that a sustainable capability program is necessary to equip school leaders with comprehensive knowledge and understanding of SIP and SBM systems. This will enhance their leadership performance. This program would enable school leaders to effectively manage and lead schools, ultimately improving school outcomes.

Introduction

The implementation of School Improvement Plans (SIPs) and School-Based Management (SBMs) is an emerging trend in Philippine education. School heads have been empowered by the Department of Education (DepEd) and greater emphasis has been placed on school-based management. A major trend in education reform aims to improve the quality of education services provided by the government and schools. In addition to meeting the goals and outcomes of the schools it serves, a quality education system meets the needs of students, communities, and society as a whole, and enables students to acquire the knowledge and skills they require for the 21st century (Stone, Bruce & Hursh, 2007).

The school head is responsible for managing and leading the school. They are primarily responsible for overseeing the overall operation of the school. Leaders and managers who are

capable of performing both roles shape the school organization as a whole. As stated by Cruz, et. al. (2016), school managers are encouraged to develop and adopt the necessary skills to create a conducive learning and teaching environment. In response to the constant pressures placed on the school organization by various stakeholders within the educational process, the school organization's needs continue to evolve. In order to improve a school, school heads play a key role. Experts, however, suggest that school leadership should be distributed throughout the school in order to facilitate implementation. This practice can result in a strong sense of ownership among key actors and stakeholders. In order to better understand and assess school problems and needs, identify opportunities for improvement, and prioritize improvement projects, school improvement groups collaborate with school officials. Another advantage of this approach is the inclusion of diverse perspectives and experiences in the improvement plan (Hanover Research, 2014)

Educators are challenged to improve their leadership and managerial skills in order to improve reform, change, and innovation. It is important to rebalance the new opportunities and threats with the critical elements of management as new trends emerge in leading and managing organizations. As a result, school heads are able to deal effectively with these changes. It is crucial for school leaders to have strong leadership skills in order to be effective in fiscal management. Therefore, school heads may participate in seminars and workshops on leadership management and fiscal management to enhance their skills in these aspects (Von, Lumapenet & Mamburao, 2022). Additionally, school heads must be proficient in technological leadership skills in order to manage a school crisis effectively. Those school heads who are able to manage crises effectively will be more likely to lead an exemplary school development program (Otto & Lumapenet, 2022).

By setting realistic goals and taking action aligned with those goals, Escobar (2019) describes this as a continuous improvement process aimed at improving academic results and enriching the student experience. In order to achieve these objectives, leaders and planning teams must establish priorities, set goals, develop strategies, and engage staff and other stakeholders in the planning process (Armstrong, 1982; Kotler & Murphy, 1981). It can be described as a plan for improving schools that takes into consideration the context, the culture, and the results of students. By doing so, the organization is able to set attainable and contextualized goals that are in line with its current realities. Aside from fostering learning achievements, this will also enhance the virtues of the students. There are some researchers, however, who argue that formal improvement planning does not necessarily result in school performance enhancements and subsequently improved student learning outcomes (Bell, 2002; Mintzberg, 1994). Thus, this study was conceived to focus on the impact of school heads' planning for improvements on school-based management.

This study is based on the interconnection between the schools heads' managerial role concerning the SIP associated with their leadership role in implementing SBM. It is essential for this study that there exists an assumption whereby school heads' managerial performance in SIP related to his/her planning, organizing and executing school improvement activities is

considerable as a leader's effectiveness in SBM. School heads' effective performance in managing SIP is expected to boost their leadership performance regarding SBM because successful plan-do-check-act cycle encourages leaders and managers alike with regard to SBMs. This assumption is grounded within the behavioral realm of management where success results significantly depends upon sound investments both efficiently performed management and intelligent credited leadership. In schools

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is in its potential to enhance the understanding of effective school leadership and management, especially in public elementary schools. School improvement planning (SIP) and school-based management (SBM) are important for improving educational outcomes, but there is a lack of research on how school heads perform managerial tasks in SIP and their leadership roles in SBM. Existing studies have mostly concentrated on individual parts of SIP and SBM, and few have looked at how these two essential areas of school management interact. This study aims to fill this gap by examining the connection between school heads' managerial performance in SIP and their leadership performance in SBM. In doing this, the study offers valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities school heads face when implementing SIP and SBM initiatives. The findings can help shape policy and practice in school leadership, management, SIP, and SBM, ultimately leading to better educational outcomes.

Many studies, including those by Hallinger and Heck (1998), show how school leadership and management can improve student outcomes. Hopkins (2001) points out areas for improvement in schools using SIP, enabling them to create targeted interventions. As a result of SBM, decentralization, community participation, and school autonomy have been promoted in a variety of contexts (Caldwell & Spinks, 1998). In spite of this, the success of SIP and SBM initiatives depends heavily on the leadership and management skills of school heads.

Limitation of the Study

This study focused on public elementary schools in Maguindanao II and Cotabato City, which may limit its applicability to other areas. The sample size included only 148 teachers, and the study used a complete enumeration sampling method. This approach might not reflect the entire teacher population in the region. The study also relied on self-reported data from teachers, which could introduce bias and limitations. Additionally, the research did not account for contextual factors that might affect the link between school heads' management and leadership performance, such as school culture, teacher experience, and community involvement. The cross-sectional study design makes it harder to establish cause and effect between the variables. Despite these limitations, the study offers valuable insights into the relationship between school heads' management and leadership performance. Future research can address these issues and explore the topic in more detail.

Related Literature

The planning and management of school improvement have been studied thoroughly over the years. Several policies have been created for SBM, including the School Governing Council (SGC), the Assessment of Levels of Practice (ALP), the School Improvement Plans (SIP), and the School Report Cards (SRC). As a result of these policies, a line item was included in the General Appropriations Act (GAA) for the purpose of implementing SBM in all public elementary and secondary schools. In 2012, the Department of Education published this report. The Department of Education (DepEd), in conjunction with other sound philosophical and legal frameworks, has been implementing a number of projects, programs, and activities (PPAs) that integrate SBM. This initiative consists of Brigada Eskwela, Every Child-a-Reader Program, School First Initiative, Child-Friendly School System, Project WATCH (We Advocate Time Consciousness and Honesty); and Adopt-a-School.

On the other hand, there is widespread support for SBM among policymakers and even governments around the world. Among the reasons is that principals are the right people to manage education resources for the benefit of the wider community. Indicators of school performance include student outcomes (Dimmock, 2013). Further, Schools-Based Management (SBM) has become increasingly popular across the globe as a means to achieve school improvement through autonomy, shared decision-making, and partnership within the school community (San Antonio, D. M., & Gamage, D. T. (2007); Anderson, W. (2006); Gamage, D.T. (2006); Gamage, D.T. (1996); Gamage, D.T. (1996); Caldwell, B.J. (2005); Cranston, N.C. (2001); Whitty, G., Power, S., & Halpin, D., (1998); Marburger, C. M. (1991); Brown, D.J. (1990); Guiamalon, T. et.al (2021)). By giving school stakeholders additional power and authority, SBM is considered as an effective method for empowering local schools in decision-making. In other words, in terms of self-decision-making, administrators are not the only individuals in charge, but also educational specialists, principals, teachers, parents, students, and others with an interest in education.

Cruz, et.al. (2016). examined how school heads can improve their managerial performance. Based on the findings of the study, school heads performed their managerial functions very satisfactorily in all areas identified. Additionally, school heads demonstrated significant differences in their managerial performance in vision and mission goals, financial planning, physical plant and facilities, community relations, and school improvement plans. The key to prompting school improvement is the principal's transformational leadership, according to Yingxiu Yang (2013). In addition to solving pertinent problems, it can help improve various aspects of the school. Developing transformational leadership involves three stages: embryonic, formative, and mature. A principal's transformational leadership skills can be seen in informing ideas, building shared vision, sharing power, gaining credibility, and experiencing success. An effective principal engages and manages staff, leads and monitors curriculum delivery allocates resources effectively, and responds to external stakeholders' demands, according to Hanova Research (2014). This role has proven to be particularly critical during the improvement process since the role of the principal affects many school functions. It is therefore imperative that districts pay close attention to the quality of their principals during the early stages of continuous

improvement and beyond. Fernandez (2011) examines a unique set of data from the Clark County School District, the fifth largest in the nation, to explore the relationship between SIP quality and school performance. Fernandez notes that a positive correlation exists between a school's academic performance and the quality of its strategic planning, according to the findings of this study. In addition to improving teachers' and schools' capacity for increasing student achievement, systemic school improvement interventions address multiple elements of education systems which are interconnected and interdependent (Hargreaves, Halász, and Pont 2007). There are a variety of components that may contribute to an effective school (Clune 1998; Supovitz and Taylor 2005), including its curriculum, its professional development opportunities, its instructional practices, and its assessment procedures.

For policymakers and institutions of higher learning with educational leadership programs, preparing aspiring school principals and supporting current school principals is a critical priority. The current and future context of improving student achievement and the teaching/learning environment in schools requires principals who are familiar with the most current and compelling theories and practices of school leadership. Research suggests a direct correlation between the leadership abilities of a school leader and student achievement Heck, R. H. & Hallinger, P. (2014). In the Calabar Education Zone, Owan and Agunwa (2019) look at "principals' administrative competence and teachers' work performance."This study revealed that teachers' work performance is significantly affected by the supervisory, leadership, and communication competencies of principals in terms of instructional delivery, attendance, note-taking, and record-keeping. In addition, principals' supervisory, leadership, and communication skills have a significant impact on teachers' work performance in terms of instructional delivery and class attendance. These findings led to a recommendation that secondary school principals should jointly practice close supervision of teachers, effective leadership styles, and effective communication in order to improve teachers' work.

Using a model to show the relationship between principal competencies and the achievement of the Indonesian Education Standard, Yasin, et.al (2013) explore the level of principal competencies in the Southern Province of Sulawesi, Indonesia. Results from the study suggest that respondents perceive school principals as having high competency levels. In addition, the results showed that a principal's leadership competencies directly influenced the achievement of the SNP. School leadership comes only second to classroom teaching among the factors related to school effectiveness (Louis K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010); Leithwood, K., & Sun, J., 2012). Research has shown that school governance with devolution of decision-making authority to the school level in the ACT provides additional freedom and autonomy, as well as improving equity among schools and creating more flexibility in school facilities (Abu-Duhou, I.A. (1999); Gamage, D.T. (1993a). Accordingly, SBM has a high level of effectiveness. According to the study, SBM has had the greatest impact on enhancing local decision-making at the school level and increasing student achievement. The report shows that SBM policies have created better learning environments for students and increased opportunities for staff to develop their skills.

Statement of the Problem

This study attempts to find out the relationship between the managerial performance of the school heads in school improvement planning (SIP) to their leadership performance in the implementation of school -based management (SBM) in selected elementary schools in the Division of Maguindanao II and Cotabato City for the school year 2014-2015. It is important to understand this relationship as it provides a basis to highlight where improvements are required and for targeted interventions to improve the leadership and management in schools in order to improve educational outcomes. Specifically, it aims to:

1. To assess the extent of school heads' managerial performance in school improvement planning.
2. To evaluate the extent of school heads' leadership performance in implementing school-based management.
3. To determine the significant influence between school heads' managerial performance in SIP and their leadership performance in SBM.

Methodology

In this study, descriptive correlational survey research was employed. Calmorin and Calmorin (1996) explain that descriptive research is used when the purpose of the study is to find new truths about the present condition. Usually, this method is used when the data gathered is relevant to the present situation. This provides the most relevant facts to be reported and allows attention to be focused on the most essential issues. Fraenkel and Wallen (1993), Calmorin and Calmorin (1996), and Bautista (1998) have described survey research design as a methodology that can be used to analyze natural phenomena as well as to answer questions about the distribution and relationship of people. In order to assess the incidence, distribution, and interconnections of phenomena and variables that occur in people's lives, data will be collected from at least a portion of the general population.

This study employed a complete enumeration sampling procedure to select participants from public elementary schools in Maguindanao II and Cotabato City School Divisions. This approach ensured that all 148 teachers from the target population were included in the survey, providing a comprehensive representation of the population. The study took a thorough approach by using complete enumeration, which helped reduce sampling errors. However, it also recognized the possibility of non-sampling errors that could affect the findings (Gautam, 2020). To address these issues, great care was taken in how data was collected and processed.

For analyzing and interpreting the results, the Mean was utilized to tackle objectives 1 and 2. Additionally, Pearson Product Moment and Regression Analysis were employed to address objective 3, all at a 5% level of significance Interviews were conducted with respondents to support their responses to the survey questionnaire.

Results and Discussions

School Heads Managerial Performance in School Improvement Plan. It is evident from table 1 that school heads' managerial performance is very high when it comes to school improvement plans. They demonstrated excellent managerial performance when planning school improvement. School heads lead meetings with staff, school councils, parents, and other community members in order to develop a plan for school improvement. In addition, the school head ensured that professional development activities related to achieving the school's improvement goals were included in the meetings. According to Hanover Research (2014), school heads should engage and manage their staff, monitor curriculum delivery, and allocate resources effectively. The influence of a school head has been demonstrated across a wide range of school functions during the improvement process.

Studies (e.g., Louis & Robinson, 2012) suggest that school accountability policies such as School Improvement Plans influence educators' work. Educators can therefore determine what is and is not important when developing and implementing an SIP based on the design and characteristics of the SIP template (Mintrop et al., 2001). As part of the school improvement planning process, the school head ensures that everyone is involved and kept informed of the school's progress and the improvement plan. In accordance with the school plan, the school head provides ongoing support to teachers. In addition, they ensure that the school budget reflects and supports the plan's goals and strategies for implementation. As part of their responsibilities, they ensure that the final school plan is communicated to all members of the school community and assist them in understanding their roles. On a regular basis, they monitor the effectiveness of school improvement plans. A school improvement plan has been effectively managed by its leaders. Particularly when it comes to providing immediate solutions to the challenges that teachers and students face.

School improvement planning has its roots in two predominant areas in the United States: (a) the strategic planning process of businesses and (b) the effective school's movement. Similarly, to strategic plans developed by businesses, school improvement plans (SIPs) also include goals that set a school's overall direction, measurable objectives to achieve those objectives, strategies to achieve those objectives, and action steps to implement those strategies (Duke et al., 2013). There are also evidence that higher-quality SIPs are associated with improved school performance, including student performance on ELA and mathematics standardized tests (Huber & Conway, 2015; VanGronigen & Meyers, 2022). Fernandez (2011), for example, found that Nevada public schools had more successful SIPs when they set specific, time-bound goals and tracked progress.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is implemented in Philippine schools in accordance with RA 9155 (Diamante, 2022). As a general framework, the act identifies principal and leadership objectives, as well as the core values of transparency and accountability for local school management. School improvement plans are roadmaps outlining specific interventions a school will take within three consecutive years, in collaboration with the community and other stakeholders. It strives to provide school planners with an evidence-based, systematic approach

that starts from the learner's perspective. Its purpose is to help schools achieve the goal of providing quality education to learners. According to RA 9155, school management must be decentralized. It recognizes the role of local governments and other stakeholders in offering basic education services. The Schools First Initiative (SFI) was introduced by the Department of Education in 2005 to empower schools and community stakeholders to address quality and access to education. In 2006, the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA) was launched. It enabled the formulation of several enabling policies on SBM, including School Improvement Planning (SIP), to sustain and expand SFI gains through School-Based Management (SBM).

The findings of this study asserted that school improvement plans (SIPs) are implemented to a significant extent based on the leadership performance of school heads. The leadership and direction they provide are essential in fostering a collaborative environment where teachers, parents, and community members work together towards common educational goals. The involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making process enhances educational outcomes as well as the alignment of SIP with the school's vision and resources.

Table 1. School Heads Managerial Performance in School Improvement Plan

Items	Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. Explain the school improvement planning process to teachers, parents, and community members.	3.61	Highly Performed
2. Engages teachers, parents, and community members in the process.	3.52	Highly Performed
3. Organizes meetings of parents, school councils, and staff members for the purpose of school improvement.	3.73	Highly Performed
4. Assess teachers' implementation of the school improvement plan.	3.54	Highly Performed
5. Assure that school budgets reflect and support the plan's goals.	3.50	Highly Performed
6. Support and develop staff members as they follow the plan's strategies.	3.61	Highly Performed
7. Incorporates professional development activities that align with the school's improvement goals in every meeting.	3.60	Highly Performed
8. Develops and implements the plan with teachers' involvement.	3.69	Highly Performed
9. Communicate regularly about the school's improvement plan and progress to everyone involved.	3.72	Highly Performed
10. Ensure that the final school plan is communicated to all school community members	3.55	Highly Performed
Grand Mean	**3.61**	**Highly Performed**

Leadership Performance in Implementing School Based-Management. It is evident from Table 2 that school heads have outstanding leadership skills in the area of school-based management. To enhance curricular programs, school heads set policies and guidelines for co-curricular activities. Implements programs and is closely monitored to address performance discrepancies, and to ensure that curriculum and learning are anchored in the contexts of the community, aspirations, and of learners. Furthermore, the school head assesses the content and methods used to teach creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving. They develop standards for learning management and delivery systems that take diversity into account. This result suggests that school heads possess instructional leadership qualities. As a result, this study confirms Dim mock's (2013) finding that school principals possess extensive knowledge of how to manage education resources.

School-based management initiatives enable local schools to make better decisions about their specific educational needs, as stated in Obias (2023). School-Based Management, according to Pepito and Acibar (2019), aims to empower school leaders by transforming school administration dynamics from a centralized to a decentralized approach. In addition, they discovered that almost all principles are influenced by central authority intervention. This contributes to SBM's effectiveness in achieving expected benefits. By implementing SBM, the school encourages a large authority scale for school players. This includes optimal stakeholder involvement, clear information systems, and reward systems that promote quality education (Jaelani and Masnun, 2019). Consequently, schools adopt School-based Management to set their own goals and create localized methods to reach them, and to share decision-making with teachers, parents, and other stakeholders. As a result of decentralization, school stakeholders will be more likely to understand the existing realities in a school and make appropriate decisions accordingly.

With school-based management, schools have autonomy and resources tailored to their specific needs. Implementing it led to improved student outcomes. Khattri et al. (2010) investigated the overall impact of school-based management on student performance in 23 Philippine school districts for the year 2003 to 2005 using administrative datasets of public schools. They evaluated whether schools that received early interventions such as SBM training and funding to achieved higher average test scores than those that did not. In the 23 participating schools included in the study, school-based management resulted in significantly or had positive effects on students test scores.

Table 2. Schools Head Leadership Performance in School Based- Management

Item	Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. Ensure that the implemented curriculum is localized in order to make it relevant and applicable to students.	3.51	Highly Performed
2. Maintain a regular review of the learning system to ensure the holistic development of learners and the community.	3.57	Highly Performed
3. Ensure that programs are implemented and performance discrepancies are addressed.	3.69	Highly Performed
4. Ensure learners' rights are respected in the design of the curriculum as well as in the structure of the whole learning environment.	3.56	Highly Performed
5. Analyze the content and methods used to teach creative thinking, critical thinking, and problem-solving.	3.66	Highly Performed
6. Designing learning management and delivery models for different types of learners.	3.57	Highly Performed
7. Establish policies and guidelines for co-curricular activities that support the curricular programs.	3.77	Highly Performed
8. Create standards for learning management and delivery systems that take diversity into account.	3.68	Highly Performed
9. Examine how learning systems and curriculums are anchored in the context of learning communities.	3.67	Highly Performed
10. Monitors and evaluates the results of the localized Daily Learning Plan and Instructional Materials.	3.51	Highly Performed
Grand Mean	**3.62**	**Highly Performed**

Influence of School heads Management Performance in SIP to their Leadership Performance in Implementing the School-Based Management

Using the model summary of multiple linear regression analysis in Table 3, the R-value indicates that several correlation coefficients explain the relationship between school heads' management performance in SIP and their leadership performance in implementing SBM based on the multiple linear regression analysis. School heads' leadership performance in implementing SBM accounted for 91.5% of the variance in their management performance in SIP, as determined by the regression model R square coefficient of .915. Other variables not included in this study accounted for the remaining 8.5% of variance in their leadership performance in implementing SBM. School heads leadership performance in adopting SBM is significantly explained by the overall model. This is shown in Table 3 with F value of $(1,28) = 302.297$ $p < .05$ among school heads management performance in SIP and their leadership performance in implementing SBM.

Hence, the more effective the school heads are at improving their schools, the better they are at implementing school-based management. In a relevant study, all dimensions of self-management, such as decision-making, resource and personnel management, resource availability, and organizational structure, were positively associated with school effectiveness. Also, resources management, personnel, and organizational structure were fully mediated by motivation (Arar & Nasra, 2018). In addition, strong leadership, comprehensive professional development, and a collaborative school climate were found to positively impact school governance and management, while teachers' work, school-based curriculum, and student learning were all significant when they were also (Ko et al. 2016).

Table 3. Regression Analysis Result on the Influence of School heads Management Performance in SIP to their Leadership Performance in Implementing the School-Based Management

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.957[a]	.915	.912	.27763755

a. Predictors: (Constant), School Heads Management Performance in SIP

Table 3.1. ANOVA Results on the Influence of School heads Management Performance in SIP to their Leadership Performance in Implementing the School-Based Management

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	23.302	1	23.302	302.297	.000[b]
	Residual	2.158	28	.077		
	Total	25.460	29			

Dependent Variable: School Heads Leadership Performance in SBM

Predictors: (Constant), School Heads Management Performance in SIP

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study underscores the pivotal role of school heads in effectively managing school improvement plans. This ensures the successful implementation of school-based management. The findings highlight those tailored approaches, contextualized to each school's unique needs, are crucial for achieving desired outcomes. Ultimately, a clear vision and collective participation from the entire school community are essential for driving meaningful improvement. By understanding the significance of leadership and community involvement, schools can tap into their potential to create a culture of ongoing improvement and excellence.

Recommendations

According to the study's findings, it's suggested that a sustainable capability program be established to equip school leaders with the essential knowledge and skills needed to effectively carry out School Improvement Plans (SIP) and School-Based Management (SBM). This program would offer thorough training, empowering leaders to manage and guide their schools more effectively. By boosting their skills, school leaders would gain a competitive advantage, ultimately leading to greater success for their schools.

Recommendations for Further Study

To dive deeper into effective school leadership and management, here are some recommendations that could really help shape future research and offer valuable insights:
1. It would be beneficial to conduct a replication study in a different region or country to see if the findings hold true across various contexts.
2. A longitudinal study could be useful to track how the management and leadership performance of school heads evolves over time and to evaluate their long-term effects on school success.
3. Engaging in qualitative research, like interviews or case studies, can provide a richer understanding of the factors that shape school heads' managerial and leadership abilities.
4. Its also worth exploring potential mediating factors, such as teacher motivation or school culture that might influence how well school heads perform in their roles.
5. Finally, assessing the effectiveness of interventions aimed at enhancing school heads' management and leadership skills could yield important insights.

Ethical Consideration

Before collecting any data, ethics committee approval was sought. As part of the informed consent process, participants were made aware of the study's objectives. They were also informed what would be expected of them, and that they could back out at any time without consequences. The identities of all participants were protected throughout the research process, keeping everything confidential and anonymous.

References

Abu-Duhou, I.A. (1999). *School-Based Management*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (UNESCO).

Abulencia, A.A. n.d. School-Based Management: A Structural Reform Intervention. Center for Linkages and Extension, Philippine Normal University.

Anderson, W. (2006). Site-Based Management. In S.C Smith & P.K. Piele (Eds.), *School Leadership: Handbook for excellence in student learning* (pp. 223- 244). London: SAGE Publications.

Armstrong, J. S. (1982). The value of formal planning for strategic decisions: review of empirical research. Strategic Management Journal, 3(3)197–211.

Bautista, V.A. 1998. Research and Public Management. UP Open University: Diliman, Quezon City.

Bell, L. (2002). Strategic planning and school management: full of sound and fury, signifying nothing? Journal of Educational Administration, 40(5), 407–424. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230210440276

Best Practices for School Improvement Planning (2014). https://www.hanoverresearch.com/media/Best-Practices-for-School-Improvement-Planning.pdf

Brown, D.J. (1990). *Decentralization and School-Based Management.* London: The Falmer Press.

Bush, T., & Gamage, D.T. (2001). Models of Self-governance in Schools: Australia Caldwell, B.J. (2005). *School-Based Management.* http://unesdoc.unesco.org/.

Calmorin, L. and M. Calmorin. 1996. Method of Research and Thesis Writing. Quezon City: Rex Book Store.

Canton Mayo, I. (2009). Modelo sistemico de evaluacion de planes de mejora. Leon, Spain: Universidad de Leon, Area de publicaciones.

Clune, W. (1998). Toward a theory of systemic reform: the case of nine NSF statewide systemic initiatives. Research Monograph No. 16. Madison, WI: National Institute for Science Education.

Cranston, N.C. (2001).Collaborative Decision-Making and School-Based

Cruz, et.al. (2016). Towards Enhancing the Managerial Performance of School Heads.

nternational Review of Management and Business Research Vol. 5 Issue 2. www.irmbrjournal.com

Department of Education (2012). Implementing Guidelines on the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) Framework, Assessment Process and Tool (APAT). In DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012. DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City.

Diamante, R. (2022). e Implementation of the Enhanced School Improvement Plan (ESIP) of the Secondary Schools in the Division of Bayugan City, Philippines: Basis for Improvement of the Next Planning Cycle. SMCC Higher Education Research Journal. ISSN:2449-4402. ISSN Online: 2467-6322. Volume 9. January 2022.

Duke, D. L., Carr, M., & Sterrett, W. (2013). The school improvement planning handbook: Getting focused for turnaround and transition. Rowman & Littlefield.

Escobar, I. H. G. (2019). School improvement plans, a tool to improve the quality of education. New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences. [Online]. 6(1), pp 440–450. Available from: www.prosoc.eu

Fernandez, K. E. (2011). Evaluating school improvement plans and their affect on academic performance. Educational Policy, 25(2), 338–367. doi:10.1177/0895904809351693

Fraenkel, J.R. and Wallen, N.E. 1993. How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (2nd edition). New York: McGraw–Hill Book Company. Philippine Copyright 1994 by National Book Store, Inc

Gamage, D.T. (1993a). A Review of Community Participation in School Governance: An emerging culture in Australian education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 41* (2), 134-149.

Gamage, D.T. (1996). *School-Based Management: Theory, research, and practice.* Colombo: Karunaratne and Sons Ltd.

Gamage, D.T. (2006). School-Based Management: Shared responsibility and quality in education. *Education and Society, 24* (1), 27-43.

Gamage, DT. (1996). *Building Partnerships Towards the Creation of Effective Schools: An Australian case study* (A Paper Presented at the ERA-AARE Joint Conference in Singapore). http:// www.aare.edu.au/

Gautam, A. (2020). Sample Survey VS Complete Enumeration. https://anshulee-gautam.medium.com/sample-survey-vs-complete-enumeration-cb7f8157dc7b

George, T. (2022). Mixed Methods Research | Definition, Guide & Examples. https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/mixed-methods-research/

Hanova Research (2014), District Administration Practice, http://w.w.w.HanovaResearch.com. http://ijaedu.ocerintjournals.org

Hargreaves, A., Halász, G., and Pont, B. (2007). School leadership for systemic improvement in Finland: A case study report for the OECD activity improving school leadership. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/dataoecd/43/17/39928629.pdf

Heck, R. H. & Hallinger, P. (2014). Modelling the effects of school leadership on teaching and learning over time. Journal of Educational Administration, 52(5), 653-681

Huber, D. J., & Conway, J. M. (2015). The effect of school improvement planning on student achievement.Planning and Changing,46(1/2), 56–70.

Kotler, P. & Murphy, P. E. (1981). Strategic planning for higher education. The Journal of Higher Education, 52, 470–489

Louis, K. S., & Robinson, V. M. (2012). External mandates and instructional leadership: School leaders as mediating agents. Journal of Educational Administration, 50(5), 629–665. https:// doi.org/10.1108/09578231211249853

Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research.Educational Administration Quarterly, 48(3), 387-423. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11436268

Louis K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning. Final report of research Findings. New York: Wallace Foundation.

Management: Challenges, rhetoric, and reality. *Journal of Educational Inquiry, 2* (2), 1-24.

Marburger, C. M. (1991). *One School at a Time, School-Based Management: A process for change*. Columbia: The National Committee for Citizens in Education.

McNamara, C. (2003). Field guide to nonprofit strategic planning and facilitation. Minneapolis, MN: Authenticity Consulting. doi:10.13251/j.issn.0254-6051.2015.12.016

Mintrop, H., MacLellan, A. M., & Quintero, M. F. (2001). School improvement plans in schools on probation: a comparative content analysis across three accountability systems. Educational Administration Quarterly, 37(2), 197–218. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F00131610121969299

Mintzberg, H. (1994). The rise and fall of strategic planning: reconceiving roles for planning, plans, planners. New York, NY: Free Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.es/books?id=TugplxDii8MC

Otto, L., & Lumapenet, H. (2022). Technological Leadership and Crisis Management Skills of the School Administrators Towards School Development in the Special Geographical Area of MBHTE-BARMM. *International Journal Of Advance Research And Innovative Ideas In Education*, *8*(3), 3934-3937.

Owan and Agunwa (2019) "principals' administrative competence and teachers work performance" in Calabar Education zone

Pedro, F., Abad, F., Arboix, E., Chaves, M., Gimeno, S., Roca, S., … Gomez, J. M. (2005). Marco general para el establecimiento, el seguimiento y la revision de los planes de mejora. Barcelona, Spain: Agencia per a La Qualitat Del Sistema Universitari de Catalunya.

San Antonio, D. M., & Gamage, D. T. (2007). Building Trust among Educational Stakeholders through Participatory School Administration, Leadership and Management. *Management in Education*, *21*(1), 15-22.

San Miguel, V. (2019). THE IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN. https://www.depedmalaybalay.net/articles/the-importance-of-school-improvement plan.html#:~:text=school%20improvement%20plan%20is%20a,intended%20outcome%20 for%20the%20learners.

Supovitz, J.A., and Taylor, B.S. (2005). Systemic education evaluation: evaluating the impact of system wide reform education. American Journal of Evaluation, 26, 204–230.

Whitty, G., Power, S., & Halpin, D., (1998). *Devolution and Choice in Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Yasin, et.al (2013) the level of principal competencies in the Southern Province of Sulawesi, Indonesia

Yingxiu Yang (2013) Principals' Transformational Leadership in School Improvement: Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education Fall 2013 (Volume 9 Issue 2)

VanGronigen, B. A., & Meyers, C. V. (2022). Exploring the association between short-cycle school improvement planning and student achievement in underperforming schools. Journal of School Leadership, 32(4), 339–361. https://doi. org/10.1177/10526846211018207