

Assessment of School Improvement Plan 2013-2015: Basis for the Technical Assistance Plan

Dr. Araceli A. Craus¹, Dr. Princess Jeah Marie Sotto Geroso², Guarin S. Maguate³

Department of Education, Philippines

Senior Education Program Specialist for Planning and Research

Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology

Program Head MPA & DPA, Philippines

Secondary Science Teacher, Department of Education, Philippines

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the level of assessment of School Improvement Plan 2013-2015: basis for the Technical Assistance Plan in the Division of Sagay City, Negros Occidental. The respondents of the study were the 72 school heads, 72 teachers-representatives who were member of the school planning team, 72 parents and 25 LGU representatives in the Division of Sagay City. The validated instruments were distributed and discussed during the Focus Group Discussion to the four group of respondents. The study employed the descriptive research design. The processing of data was done with the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Software. The mean was used to determine the level of assessment of the four groups of respondents in the three phases and when they are grouped according to their profile variables. Mann-Whitney U-Test was used to determine whether or not significant difference existed on the level of assessment of school improvement plan in the three phases when the four group of respondents were grouped and compared according to their profile variables. Qualitative questions were classified, grouped and synthesized based on the magnitude of observation for intervention. Results of the study showed that the level of assessment of the school heads revealed a very high rating in the Assess, Plan and Act phases and when taken as a whole. Teachers rated the three phases in a high level. Parents rated the Assess phase in a high level, while Plan and Act phases in a moderate level. Likewise, LGU representatives rates the Assess phase in a very high level, Plan phase as high level and the Act phase as moderate level. When differences were considered school heads, parents and LGU representatives find no significant difference on the level of assessment on school improvement plan. Teachers revealed a significant difference in the Assess phase when grouped and compared according to position title. For the Plan phase, a significant difference found when grouped according to highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income. Further, for Act phase, a significant difference existed when grouped according to age. The rest of the responses find no significant difference.

Examining deeper the results of the study reveals that it is essential for DepEd Division of Sagay City to package technical assistance plan for the four respondents on various issues contributory to the crafting of School Improvement Plan.

Keywords: Assessment, School Improvement Plan, Technical Assistance Plan

Introduction

Every learning institution intends to have their learners gain success. The need to be focused on certain specific goals and strategies for change are significant elements for these desire to be achieved. School Improvement Planning is a process whereby a school sets goals and decides when and how these goals can be achieved. Raising the bar of learner's academic achievement, fortifying the curriculum design, enriching the learning environment, and linkages adequately monitored between parents, community and stakeholders are among the goals (Republic Act 9155). School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a roadmap whereby the school sets the goals to improve the learner's achievement level, make changes as necessary and establish time

frame as to when and how these goals can be achieved. The guiding principle of SIP is spelled out in accordance with the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 otherwise as the RA 9155 that promotes shared governance through School-Based Management (SBM). Under this mandate, school heads are tasked to develop the SIP with the participation of the School Planning Team (SPT) such as teachers, parents, local government or community leaders, the learners, and other stakeholders. The improvement plan entails the crafting for a period of three (3) year that aims to improve the three key results areas in basic education namely: access, quality, and governance. The SIP shall be evidenced-based, results-based, and learner-centered anchored on the DepEd vision, mission, core values, and goals. With the help of the SPT the crafting of SIP follows the three (3) phases, Assess, Plan, and Act. The SIP cycle begins with the Assess where the identification of the Priority Improvement Areas (PIAs) is done and the general objectives of the school for the SIP are set. The Plan phase involves the preparation and writing of the SIP and AIP. The next phase is the Act phase that involves the testing or implementation of the solutions. At the end of Act for both the SIP and AIP, the cycle goes back to the Asses phase. The cycle of next annual implementation plan begins with the review of the PIAs and the identification of programs and projects deemed successful (DO 44, 2015). The concerns on the authenticity, effectiveness and functionality of the SIP and the Annual Improvement Plan (AIP) however, becomes evident during the crafting of the SIP and AIP. It has been observed that output submitted by the school heads for review and budget defense were not sufficient to pass the rapid appraisal. For the past three cycles covering the period of nine years the phases of crafting the SIP and AIP were driven by compliance order, copying of priority areas including programs and projects, erroneous setting of objectives and fewer SIP and AIP submitted on or before the scheduled date. Lack of technical knowledge of the stakeholders who were tasked to assist in the planning compounded the problem and forcing majority of the school heads to deliver the necessary training information in their respective schools. In addition, the voluminous files of work at hand on the part of the members of the Planning Team also made way to cutting some phases of the SIP and AIP in the crafting process. The researcher who has been working in the Division of Sagay City for several years, motivated her to conduct this study to determine the level of assessment during the crafting of SIP in terms of the three phases (assess, plan and act). Findings of the study ensures the improvement in the planning and implementation processes of the school thereby the assurance of delivering fully its mandate of “quality, efficient and liberating education for all” (Leonor M. Briones, 2016).

Methodology

Research Design. The descriptive method of research was used to determine the level of assessment in the crafting of School Improvement Plan 2013-2015. According to Aquino (2012), descriptive research is a fact-finding with adequate interpretation. It is something more and beyond just data gathering. It describes and interprets what it is. Best (2012) explained that it is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist; practices and beliefs, process that are going on; effects that are being felt, or trends that are developing. It employs systematic observation and recording of data without manipulation of observed phenomenon (Tan, 2011). Hence, descriptive design is appropriate for this study as it aims to gather more information about the characteristics in the present field of investigation as well as it aids in making professional judgments. On the other hand, the qualitative analysis was also employed since it made use of the focus group approach to data collection. Creswell, (2012) stated that a focus group may be thought of as a group interview. There can be structured, semi-structured, or unstructured questions for the group to address; a difference is the researcher attending to the interaction that occurs from the discussion within the group. Primary data on school head’s (respondent) desirable attitudes, problems encountered and opportunities met in the crafting of the SIP and the importance of the SIP in their life as school head were gathered through the focus group discussions. Additionally, the researcher also gathered primary data on teacher, parents, and local government representative’s (respondents) problems encountered and opportunities met in the crafting of SIP through the focus group discussions. Finally, the researcher used the data gathered from the focus group discussion to give an in depth analysis of the primary data to come up with a technical assistance plan relative to the crafting of future SIP.

Respondents of the Study

The crafting of the School Improvement Plan is a major administrative task of the school heads that will ultimately guide them in achieving quality basic education for all. The mandate of the Basic Education Act of 2001 (RA 9155) calls for shared governance which recognizes that every unit in the education bureaucracy has a particular role, task and responsibility inherent in the office and for which it is accountable for outcomes. It is in this aspect that the right respondents to this study were these people and a representative of the local government unit in that area who helped accelerate, broaden, and sustain education effort through legislation. Taking into consideration all the essential role, it is important that the respondents of the study were the 72 school heads of the 72 schools in the Division of Sagay City. Assisting the school heads of the 72 schools were the teachers-representative who were usually elected as president of the teachers' group in that school. While the stakeholders group were 72 parents-representative who were also elected officers of the 72 schools to compose the School Planning Team. The inclusion of the barangay or LGU representative in the School Planning Team were marked essential considering the location of the 72 schools spread throughout the 25 barangays in the City of Sagay.

Research Instruments

This study utilized a self-made questionnaire based on the manual in crafting the SIP of the Department of Education per Memorandum No. 44, s. 2015. The questionnaire was composed of two parts. Part I letter A of the instrument aimed to gather information on the respondents' profile such as age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average monthly family income. For additional information, in Part I letter B to F, school heads (respondent) were asked to check the desirable attitudes (RPMS, IPCRF-DepEd guidelines, 2014) that could help in the crafting of the SIP, problems encountered, and opportunities met in the crafting of the SIP and the importance of the SIP in their life as school head.

Validity

The Criteria of Good and Scates (1954) was used to check the validity of the research instrument. Cristobal (2014) defines validity as the ability of an instrument to measure what it purports to measure. Through face validation, the instrument was presented to the three authorities on research. For the researcher's first validator is the Education Program Supervisor who is a graduate of Doctor of Philosophy major in Educational Management and member of the review and evaluation committee of the SIP in the Division of Sagay City. Next, is a Public School District Supervisor and member of the Division SIP trainers who also crafted her own school's SIP prior to her promotion. The researcher selected the third validator as her external assessor of the instrument, also a secondary school principal, crafter of the SIP and a graduate of Doctor of Philosophy major in Educational Management in the Division of Bacolod City. The obtained result was 4.85 interpreted as excellent which means that the instrument is valid.

Reliability

The validated survey-questionnaire was tested to determine its reliability using the Cronbach's Alpha. According to Cristobal (2014), reliability refers to the consistency of results. A reliable instrument yields the same rank for individuals who take the test more than once. In the conduct of the reliability of the research instrument the Cronbach Alpha was used since the items in the questionnaire were not scored as simply as right or wrong. For the instruments to be reliable, 80 respondents from the Division of Bacolod City and Handumanan National High School, Division of Bacolod City were used. Number of dry run respondents were as follows: 20 school heads, 20 teachers, 20 LGU representatives and 20 parents. The computed alpha for the questionnaire for school heads was 0.828 interpreted as "high reliable", for teachers was 0.957 interpreted as "very high reliable", for LGU representatives was 0.916 interpreted as "very high reliable, and for parents was 0.946 interpreted as "very high reliable". Taken as whole the computed alpha was 0.936, interpreted as "very high reliable". This means that the research instrument used by the researcher was reliable to a high degree.

Data Gathering Procedures

In the conduct of the study, permission from the Schools Division Superintendent was secured and the researcher was able to administer to the following: 72 school heads, 72 teachers from elected officers of the teachers' group, 72 parents and 25 LGU representatives or the barangay kagawad who were members of the

School Planning Team. Focus group discussion was used by the researcher to gather the two sets of data. One instrument for the SIP quantitative questions and the other instrument was for the qualitative questions. Specific items in the qualitative questionnaire was answered by the discussants. School Heads grouped into ten (10) districts were clustered and separated from teachers, stakeholders, and local government unit representatives. The same process of focus group discussions was employed in the non-school heads group. The accomplished instrument on the Personal Data and the School Improvement Plan assessment tool was immediately collected to ensure a 100% retrieval rate. The data gathered were collated and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. While the qualitative questionnaires were also summarized to come up with the frequencies of answers.

Statistical Tools

The data that were gathered were processed statistically using the SPSS program.

Objective No. 1 used frequency and percentage distribution to determine the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title, and average monthly family income. Frequency is a measure of the number of times that an event occurs. This was used in counting the number of respondents who belong to each category of the variables in their demographic profile. Whereas, a percentage is another way of expressing a proportion. A percentage is equal to the proportion times 100. This was used in converting the frequency into percentage of the respondents who likewise belong to each category of the variables in the demographic profile.

Objective No. 2, which sought to determine the level of assessment in crafting School Improvement Plan in the three phases and when taken as a whole, mean was used.

Mean is the most commonly used measures of central tendency. The mean is computed by adding scores and dividing the sum by the number of individuals (Bluman, 2014). Thus, mean is the most appropriate statistical tool used.

The obtained mean scores were interpreted according to the following scale:

Mean Score Range	Interpretation
4.24 - 5.04	Very High Level
3.43 – 4.23	High Level
2.62 – 3.42	Moderate Level
1.81 – 2.61	Low Level
1.00 – 1.80	Very Low Level

Objective No. 3, which sought to determine the level of assessment in crafting School Improvement Plan according to the aforementioned variables, descriptive mean was used.

Objective No. 4, which sought to determine whether or not there is a significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting School Improvement Plan 2013-2015 when the respondents are grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables and when taken as a whole, Mann Whitney U-test was used.

The Mann-Whitney U-Test is a non-parametric test used to assess for significant differences in a scale or ordinal dependent variable by a single dichotomous independent variable. It is the non-parametric equivalent of the independent samples t-test. This means that the test does not assume any properties regarding the distribution of the dependent variable in the analysis. This makes the Mann-Whitney U-test the appropriate analysis to use when analyzing dependent variables on an ordinal scale.

Further, objective Nos. 5-8, which sought to determine the desirable attitudes, the problems encountered opportunities/prospects that the school heads encountered and the SIP as part of the school heads' life, frequency and rank was used. Qualitative questions wherein common responses were classified/grouped and synthesized based on the magnitude of observations for intervention.

Results and Discussion

Table 2a presents the profile of the school heads and teachers according variable age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income. It reveals that for the school heads, majority of them are within the age bracket of 44 years and above (55% of the total population) compare to the younger ones which comprised only of 46%. There are more female school heads (56%) compare to male school heads. Seventy four (74) percent attained masters' degree and 74% of the

respondents assumed the position of either TIC or HT. In terms of average monthly income, 56% of them received below 31,847 pesos. Teachers on the other hand, in terms of age, 54% of the total population ages above 44 years old, 56% are female and has masters' degree or with CAR, 64% assumed the position of teacher I and 50% received an average family income of 22,780 pesos.

Table 2a : Profile of the School Heads and Teachers

School Head			
Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Younger (below 44 years old)	33	45.8
	Older (44 years old and above)	39	54.2
	Total	72	100.0
Sex	Male	32	44.4
	Female	40	55.6
	Total	72	100.0
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower (Bachelor's Degree)	19	26.4
	Higher (MA, MA units/CAR)	53	73.6
	Total	72	100.0
Position Title	Lower (TIC, HT)	39	54.2
	Higher (P1,P3)	33	45.8
	Total	72	100.0
Average Monthly Family Income	Lower (below 31,847)	40	55.6
	Higher (31,847 and above)	32	44.4
	Total	72	100.0
Teachers			
Age	Younger (below 39 years old)	36	50.0
	Older (39 years old and above)	36	50.0
	Total	72	100.0
Sex	Male	10	13.9
	Female	62	86.1
	Total	72	100.0
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower (Bachelor's Degree)	32	44.4
	Higher (MA, MA units/CAR)	40	55.6
	Total	72	100.0
Position Title	Lower (T1)	46	63.9
	Higher (T2-T3)	26	36.1
	Total	72	100.0
Average Monthly Family Income	Lower (below 21,804)	36	50.0
	Higher (21,804 and above)	36	50.0
	Total	72	100.0

Profile of the Parents and LGU Representatives

Table 2b presents the profile of the parents and LGU representatives according variable age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income. For parents who had participated in the study. It further divulge that 50% of the respondents ages are between below 39 years old and above, in terms of sex, 69% are female, 60% are college and even post graduates. Most of them (63%) assumed the position of Secretary to P.I.O positions. Sixty eight percent received an average monthly income of below Php17,000. In the case of the LGU representatives, fifty two (52) percent ages 44 years old and above, 69% of the respondents are female, Sixty percent are either college and post graduates, 63% assumed the position of Secretary to P.I.O officer ships and 68% received the monthly income of Php 17,000.

Table 2b : Profile of the Parents and LGU Representatives

Parents			
Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Younger (below 39 years old)	36	50.0
	Older (39 years old and above)	36	50.0
	Total	72	100.0
Sex	Male	22	30.6
	Female	50	69.4
	Total	72	100.0
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower (Elementary and High School Graduate)	29	40.3
	Higher (College and Post Graduate)	43	59.7
	Total	72	100.0
Position Title	Lower (Secretary-PIO)	45	62.5
	Higher (Pres.-Vice President)	27	37.5
	Total	72	100.0
Average Monthly Family Income	Lower (below 17,000)	49	68.1
	Higher (17,000 and above)	23	31.9
	Total	72	100.0
LGU Representative			
Age	Younger (below 44 years old)	12	48.0
	Older (44 years old and above)	13	52.8
	Total	25	100.0
Sex	Male	13	52.0
	Female	12	48.0
	Total	25	100.0
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower (Elementary and High School Graduate)	10	40.0
	Higher (College and Post Graduate)	15	60.0
	Total	25	100.0
Position Title	Lower (Appointment)	12	48.0
	Higher (Elected)	13	52.0
	Total	25	100.0
Average Monthly Family Income	Lower (below 15,000)	10	40.0
	Higher (15,000 and above)	15	60.0
	Total	25	100.0

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Three Phases

Table 3 revealed the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan in the three phases as assessed by the school heads. The level of assessment of the school heads in the Assess phase obtained an overall mean rating of “very high”. Item Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 also obtained “very high” rating while Item Nos. 9 and 10 got an interpretations of “high”. The fact that in the items Nos. 1 to 8, school heads find it easy to call, orient, collect, analyze and interpret data, identify the mission and vision particularly the core values, setting goals, reviewing priority areas, formulating general objectives and organizing teams for implementation because the people belong to the same institution and therefore has the same streamline of thoughts in the pursuit for improving the learner’s achievement level plus the fact that people involve in the education department specifically the school heads understood the expected learning expectations thus making the work easier. On the other hand, conducting interviews with the learners, parents and stakeholders and analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each

area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas obtained only the rating of “high” for several reasons. One of this is the degree by which a parent or a stakeholder involves themselves to issues concerning the performance of their children. Hence, expect one to be in conflict with time, skills, interest and competence to go in detail in terms of answering the problems included in the SIP. This matters most especially in schools located in far flung areas where educational attainment and monthly income of the people calls for them to prioritize their basic needs instead of joining the group and talk about school matters.

In the Plan phase, the overall mean rating is interpreted as “very high”. Item Nos. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 also obtained a “very high” rating. Possible reasons of accessibility and familiarization of the school heads to the nature of the SIP allowed them to make the work easier. However, when it comes to item Nos. 2 and 4 which concerns about the monitoring and implementation of the plan, the mean rating is interpreted only as “high”. Most schools find the difficulty of delegating the tasks to the council due to issue of personal schedules and probably attitudes of the members towards the endeavor. These reasons sprouted from the reality that SIP has not been fully understood by majority.

“Whenever teachers, administrators, and parents get together in a constructive and non-confrontational manner, only positive things will come out of such a gathering.” (School Improvement Planning Handbook, p.32)

In terms of Act phase, the overall mean rating is interpreted as “high” level. Item Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9 obtained a descriptive rating of “high” which concerns particularly on “Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions”, “Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years”, “Comparing results before and after testing the solution”, “Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done”, “Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions”, and “Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary”. The knowledge about the SIP seems superficial since the importance of monitoring and evaluating the entire plan has been treated of less value. Hence, expected solutions and diagnosis to every problem that is encountered cannot be achieved. The data also claim that it is easy for the School heads to identify the main issues as well as in communicating to stakeholders for support and feedback, and for exercising the mission and vision and in planning scheme. Unfortunately, these are usually done for the facilitation of school related activities with no real purpose but mainly to conduct just to have the record your performance.

According to the study of Prof. Mya Oo (2016), the need to form a professional learning community in every school, where teacher, administrators, parents, and students work together to seek out best practices, test them in the classroom, continuously improve practices, and focus on results. Prof. Oo’s study focuses on the Deming’s Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle which assess impact of teaching and systematize continuous improvement, corroborated the study on the level of assessment in the three phases Assess, Plan, and Act.

Lato and Luy (2016) in there study Improving School-Based Management Practices of Schools through Project TOW (Technical Assistance, Orientations, and Workshops/Working Groups) concluded that SBM-PASBE as assessment tool provides an excellent way to attain quality basic education, however, committed, well-trained, and constantly motivated school stakeholders given the necessary periodic technical assistance completes the success story of School-Based Management. Analysing the results of the study reveals a conflicting, sad, and disturbing reality that crafting of SIP minus those essential elements becomes mechanical and for compliance only.

Table 3 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Three Phases

Assess		Mean	Interpretation	
1	Calling for school assembly and forming School Planning Team	4.39	Very High Level	High
2	Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	4.33	Very High Level	High
3	Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.58	Very High Level	High
4	Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.68	Very High Level	High
5	Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.65	Very High Level	High
6	Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.58	Very High Level	High
7	Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.46	Very High Level	High
8	Organizing your teams for Implementation.	4.36	Very High Level	High
9	Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	4.04	High Level	
10	Analysing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	4.19	High Level	
	Overall Mean	4.43	Very High Level	High
Plan				
1	Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	4.43	Very high level	high
2	Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	4.22	High level	
3	Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	4.50	Very high level	high
4	Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	4.01	High level	
5	Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.72	Very high level	high
6	Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.74	Very high level	high
7	Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	4.79	Very high level	high
8	Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	4.38	Very high level	high
9	Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	4.32	Very high level	high
10	Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement	4.35	Very high level	high

	Plan with the Division goals.		
	Overall Mean	4.45	Very high level
Act			
1	Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	3.67	High level
2	Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.85	High level
3	Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	4.53	Very high level
4	Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	4.65	Very high level
5	Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	3.89	High level
6	Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	4.01	High level
7	Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	4.24	Very high level
8	Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.83	High level
9	Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	4.01	High level
10	Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	4.39	Very high level
	Overall Mean	4.11	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Three Phases and When Taken As a Whole

Table 4 revealed that the Assess phase and the Plan phase showed the descriptive mean rating of “very high” while the Act phase is interpreted as “high”. This means that knowledge and expertise with regards to crafting, reviewing, planning is very substantial. The Act phase however entails that there is still space for improvement when it comes to putting everything into actions of which the most important is the monitoring what had been implemented and designing of immediate resolutions to prevailing issues.

Table 4 : Level of Assessment in Crafting School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Three Phases and When Taken As a Whole

Phases	Mean	Interpretation
Assess	4.43	Very high level
Plan	4.45	Very high level
Act	4.11	High level
Overall Mean	4.33	Very high level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Three Phases

Table 5 showed results of teachers rating on the Assess phase with mean score of 4.03 interpreted as “high level” and the Act phase mean score of 3.84 interpreted as “high level”. These responses imply that in the Assess phase were preparation for the writing of SIP and AIP were being made the participation of the teachers in the formulation of the planning team, processes such as data collection, interpretation and validation, and identification of critical conditions that hinders the delivery of quality basic education were recognized. However, as in the case of the act phase in the school heads group the “high level” rate that was obtained and in the teachers group indicated the same scenario of less emphasis in the testing and reviewing

of the proposed solutions likewise, reviewing if the project structures such as people involved in the delivery of the programs and projects as priority solutions were still in tuned with their role.

Item Nos. 4, and 5 were rated a “very high level” in a way that exercising the core values stipulated in the vision and mission of the department and in determining the goals and objectives set for the welfare of the student are given the top priority. Majority however, showed less enthusiasm in terms of being called for school assembly, in orientation, in organizing and analyzing data especially the top priority areas. The bulk of tasks and the classroom activities made teachers less enthusiastic with the crafting of their school’s SIP. In terms of Plan phase, it has the overall rating of “high” rating, where calling for school assembly, orientation in the preparation of SIP, brainstorming, developing the plan’s matrix, writing the School Improvement Plan, signing the School Improvement Plan, preparing the Annual Implementation Plan, revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year, and checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals were evident and transparently support the idea that not all teachers are knowledgeable to the plan, thus manifested a unsatisfactory outcomes when it comes to level of assessment.

According to DepEd Secretary L. Briones (Quality, Accessible, Relevant, and Liberating Basic Education for All, 2016) among the demands and expectations from the public, human and financial resources were the leading inputs that should be addressed by the DepEd system. This confirms the dismal results in the assessment of the SIP crafting in this study, that teachers whose experiences in life is a struggle to meet both end felt that their participation is for compliance only. Inputs must translated into sufficient and well-trained teachers to teach minimum number of pupils/students, climate-smart school buildings, with adequate facilities such as computer kits, textbooks, and school supplies.

Addressing among others the added ancillary services of teachers as school nurse, nutritionist, canteen manager, plant cultivators, fund raisers and the likes will surely level up the quality of help the School head’s will have in school planning. Furthermore, Bottoms and Davis (2010) concluded in their study that effective districts invest in the learning not only of students, but also of teachers, principals, district staff, superintendents, and school board members. Low-performing schools are not likely to turn around unless educators who work in the schools have extensive opportunities to learn and implement more effective practices to engage students in learning challenging materials.

Table 5 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Three Phases

Assess	Mean	Interpretation
1 Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	3.75	High level
2 Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	3.58	High level
3 Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.19	High level
4 Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.60	Very high level
5 Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.43	Very high level
6 Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.04	High level
7 Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.06	High level
8 Organizing your teams for Implementation.	3.85	High level
9 Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.97	High level
10 Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant	3.82	High level

	to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.		
	Overall Mean	4.03	High level
Plan			
1	Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.94	High level
2	Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.74	High level
3	Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.62	High level
4	Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.56	High level
5	Writing the School Improvement Plan.	3.97	High level
6	Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.17	High level
7	Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	4.08	High level
8	Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	3.79	High level
9	Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	3.76	High level
10	Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	3.94	High level
	Overall Mean	3.86	High level
Act			
1	Testing and reviewing the proposed	3.67	High level
2	Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.90	High level
3	Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	3.94	High level
4	Exercising the core values, vision and mission.	4.50	Very high level
5	Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	4.00	High level
6	Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	3.72	High level
7	Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	3.81	High level
8	Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.62	High level
9	Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	3.53	High level
10	Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	3.67	High level
	Overall Mean	3.84	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Three Phases and When Taken As a Whole

Table 6 showed that in terms of level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the teachers in the Assess, Plan and Act phases disclose that each phase were descriptively interpreted as of “high “level. These data denote that teachers may not have understood the real importance and nature of SIP in their teaching and learning processes. The absence of the so-called “intellectual stimulation” that is, to think about what they are doing for their students, and provide them with opportunities to share best

practices and even pursuing their own professional development, and support their growth in terms of their profession.

Table 6 : Level of Assessment in Crating the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the Teachers in the Three Phases and When Taken As a Whole

Phases	Mean	Interpretation
Assess	4.03	High level
Plan	3.86	High level
Act	3.84	High level
Overall Mean	3.91	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Three Phases

Table 7 shows the results on the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the parents in the three phases. Parents rated the Assess phase with a mean score of 3.63 interpreted as “high level”. The Plan and Act phase were rated with the mean scores of 3.38 and 3.42 respectively interpreted as “moderate level”.

Items prepared on the Assess phase attained the “high” level except on the issue of orientation about the process of planning the SIP, thus had made the whole process of assessment as unconvincing when it comes to the quality of education.

In terms of Plan phase, item Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 attained a “high level” while item Nos. 3, 4, 8, 9 and 10 attained “moderate level”. Generally, the phase attained a rating of “moderate level”. The desire of the department to include the perspectives of the parents in the crafting of SIP is vital to the improvement of the learners, and the school.

Initial assessment similarly done by Khattri, Ling and Jha (2010), reveals that the impact of SBM on education quality, including students outcomes, remains contentious issue, with some researchers arguing that SBM leads to enhanced educational outcomes, while others contending that SBM leads to the deterioration of educational quality especially among the weakest schools. In the like manner, since it is school-based decisions on priority areas is dependent on the perceptions of those who makes the plan, proving in the same manner the results of the study.

It is important that the parents will be acquainted with all the school activities, projects and programs that need the support of the local government. In the data presented, it means that there is still a problem with regards to developing the Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams, Conducting project monitoring, in identifying programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year and 3rd year, recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP and in checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals which can be attributed to lack of orientation and proper knowledge training.

In the Act phase, data showed that in item number 4 reflects the “high level” rating in which the parents manifest strong adherence to the vision and mission of the department. While item Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 showed the ratings of “moderate level” and entails that there is a incompetence when it comes to analyzing, reviewing and interpreting the results or outcomes of the SIP after implementation. Considering the profiles of the parents that vary from every school and place plus the attitudes towards understanding the SIP is believed to influence the unsatisfactory results of the study.

“I invite everyone to work with us at the Department of Education towards realizing our shared vision of quality, accessible, relevant, and liberating basic education for all”. Leonor M. Briones

These responses imply that parents as members of the School Planning team play an important role in the crafting of the SIP and AIP. However, due to the nature of their functions the support that they deliver were limited. As in the case of attending the school assembly, responding to interviews and facilitating data validation at the barangay level on issues that come up in identifying critical conditions or the root cause of the problem, and developing project work plan and budget matrix.

Study by Morrison (2015) concluded that, beyond the differences in how the plans look according to various templates used, there are questions about what happens to the plans after they are written and if the strategies within them ever get launched. Confirming such observation is the result of this study that was rated “moderate level” item no.4 in the Plan phase that calls for “Conduct of project monitoring during the middle and the end implementation of the solutions to the root cause”. Basically, the SIP and AIP were crafted for other issues such as requirement for release of MOOE and principal’s clearance. While the issues on the act phase as far as the stakeholders was concerned was rated as “moderate level” due to the fact that there were moderate participation in the crafting of the SIP and AIP. Participation were confide to communicating support for programs and projects and their awareness of the core values, vision and mission of DepEd only.

Table 7 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Three Phases

Assess		Mean	Interpretation
1	Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team.	3.43	High level
2	Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	3.29	Moderate level
3	Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	3.71	High level
4	Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.13	High level
5	Determining your school goals and objectives.	3.93	High level
6	Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	3.69	High level
7	Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	3.69	High level
8	Organizing your teams for Implementation.	3.43	High level
9	Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.57	High level
10	Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	3.47	High level
Overall Mean		3.63	High level
Plan			
1	Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.54	High level
2	Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.43	High level
3	Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.36	Moderate level
4	Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.07	Moderate level
5	Writing the School Improvement Plan.	3.79	High level
6	Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	3.72	High level
7	Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	3.69	High level
8	Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	3.03	Moderate level

9	Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	2.99	Moderate level
10	Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	3.18	Moderate level
	Overall Mean	3.38	Moderate level
Act			
1	Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions.	2.99	Moderate level
2	Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.12	Moderate level
3	Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	3.13	Moderate level
4	Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	3.68	High level
5	Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	2.97	Moderate level
6	Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	2.86	Moderate level
7	Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	3.13	Moderate level
8	Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	2.90	Moderate level
9	Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	3.00	Moderate level
10	Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	3.12	Moderate level
	Overall Mean	3.09	Moderate level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Three Phases and When Taken As a Whole

Table 8 showed the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the parents in the three phases and when taken as a whole revealed that Assess phase attained the descriptive rating of “high level”. Whereas the Plan and Act phases showed the “moderate level” The overall mean rating is “moderate level”. This implies that parents has insufficient expertise in terms of the Plan and Act phases. Probable reasons for the moderate results in the 2 last phases are: superficial idea on “what to do” and “how to do it” process. These can be attributed to the fact that there was no evidence of intensive dissemination about the SIP to the parents and if ever there is, it is not to the point of getting the very detail of the SIP owing to time constraints.

Table 8 : Level of Assessment in Crating the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Three Phases and When Taken As a Whole

Phases	Mean	Interpretation
Assess	3.63	High level
Plan	3.38	Moderate level
Act	3.09	Moderate level
Overall Mean	3.37	Moderate level

Level of Assessment in Crafting School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Three Phases

Table 9 presents the data on the level of assessment in crafting School Improvement Plan as assessed by the LGU representatives in the three phases. The succeeding table signify the level of assessment of the LGU representatives in the Assess phase was rated “very high” and Plan phase rated as “high” while the Act phase got the “moderate”.

Item Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 imply that the LGU representatives are very active when it comes to calling for school assembly, exposed to orientation and organizing and analyzing the school data. Likewise, with the identification of core values and priority areas together with determining school goals and objectives. However, in terms of organizing the team for implementation, interviews with learners, parents and stakeholders and in determining the root cause of each area, developing project work plan and budget matrix, the LGU representatives still needs the assistance. It can be pointed however, that whenever the tasks demands for time, there is an evidence of passive attitude that often the cause of delayed results or in either case can be due to passive knowledge that compels them to take everything for granted since school authorities are more knowledgeable than them. The report developed by Bottoms and Davis (2010) also confirmed the essential elements must be in place for struggling high schools to improve in substantive ways: state-capacity building, district vision and principal leadership. State-capacity building includes improving the expenditures earmarked for reforms, capacitate leadership other those given by the education department and support building of articulate strategic plan and vision that includes framework of best practices, supportive policies and smart alignment of resources. As in this study, readers could see the missing elements thus, the results.

Table 9 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Three Phases

Assess		Mean	Interpretation
1	Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	4.36	Very high level
2	Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	4.28	Very high level
3	Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.32	Very high level
4	Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.56	Very high level
5	Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.52	Very high level
6	Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.40	Very high level
7	Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.32	Very high level
8	Organizing your teams for Implementation.	4.12	High level
9	Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	4.16	High level
10	Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	4.12	High level
	Overall Mean	4.32	Very high level

Plan			
1	Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.9 2	High level
2	Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.8 8	High level
3	Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.8 4	High level
4	Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.5 6	High level
5	Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.2 0	High level
6	Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.4 8	Very high level
7	Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	4.2 4	Very high level
8	Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	3.6 0	High level
9	Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	3.6 8	High level
10	Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	3.6 0	High level
	Overall Mean	3.9 0	High level
Act			
1	Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions.	3.2 4	Moderate level
2	Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.3 2	Moderate level
3	Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	3.3 2	Moderate level
4	Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	4.0 4	High level
5	Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	3.3 2	Moderate level
6	Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	3.3 6	Moderate level
7	Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	3.6 8	Moderate level
8	Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.3 6	Moderate level
9	Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	3.3 2	Moderate level
10	Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	3.2 4	Moderate level
	Overall Mean	3.4 2	Moderate level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representative in the Three Phases and When Taken As a Whole

Table 10 discusses the LGU representatives rating in the Assess phase with mean score of 4.32 interpreted as “very high level”. The Act phase was rated with the mean scores of 3.42 interpreted as “moderate level”. These responses imply that LGU representatives as members of the School Planning team play an important role in the crafting of the SIP and AIP. However, due to the nature of their functions the support that they deliver were limited to certain items in the Assess phase. As in the case of attending the school assembly, responding to interviews and facilitating data validation at the barangay level on issues that come up in identifying critical conditions or the root cause of the problem, and development of project work plan and budget matrix.

While the issues on the Act phase as far as the LGU representatives was concerned was rated as “moderate level” due to the fact that there were moderate participation in the crafting of the SIP and AIP. Participation were confide to communicating support for programs and projects and their awareness of the core values, vision and mission of DepEd only

Table 10 : Level of Assessment in Crafting School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU representatives in the Three Phases and When Taken As a Whole

Phases	Mean	Interpretation
Assess	4.32	Very high level
Plan	3.90	High level
Act	3.42	Moderate level
Overall Mean	3.88	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Schools Heads in the Assess Phase

When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 11 reflects information on the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the school heads in the Assess phase when grouped according to age and sex. For the responses of the school heads on the Assess phase, regardless of their age and sex, matters concerning about calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team, planning scheme for the formulation of SIP, data review, identifying core values and supporting it, determining goals and objectives, or identifying priority goals were rated as “very high”. This denotes that young or old, male or female, they have the desire to make it active in terms of crafting the SIP intended for the improvement of the learners, On the other hand, validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders, and analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas proved only as “high”. The study of Hofosha, (2012) reveals that even though SIP was implemented observable challenges like inadequate participation of stakeholders, lack of experience and skills among school principals, and low coordination of school community might have hindered the program from achieving its objectives. Making a very similar findings in the present study.

Corroborating the study of this researcher and the observations done by Hofosha, (2012) and the Hanover Research (2014) on best practices of the SIP enumerated the essential components such as the data-driven decision making, feasible goals and benchmarks, comprehensive need-assessment incorporating the quantitative and qualitative data, emphasize the primary focus of leadership teams should be supporting schools rather than compliance.

School heads are demanded to take charge of their school’ SIP, hence, regardless of their age and sex, such tasks are supposedly to be address by them together with the school’s planning team. In the study, results showed that whether the school heads are young or old, male or female, the fact that as crafters of the SIP, they have the sole responsibility of spearheading and delivering the knowledge training to their fellow team members acting as key players in the school improvement process. Thus, the results.

Table 11 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Assess Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	4.42	Very high level	4.36	Very high level	4.44	Very high level	4.35	Very high level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	4.39	Very high level	4.28	Very high level	4.44	Very high level	4.25	Very high level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.61	Very high level	4.56	Very high level	4.53	Very high level	4.63	Very high level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.82	Very high level	4.56	Very high level	4.66	Very high level	4.70	Very high level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.67	Very high level	4.64	Very high level	4.62	Very high level	4.68	Very high level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.61	Very high level	4.56	Very high level	4.62	Very high level	4.55	Very high level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.45	Very high level	4.46	Very high level	4.44	Very high level	4.48	Very high level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	4.36	Very high level	4.36	Very high level	4.22	Very high level	4.48	Very high level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews	3.97	High level	4.10	High level	4.13	High level	3.98	High level

with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.								
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	4.21	High level	4.18	High level	4.13	High level	4.25	Very high level
Overall Mean	4.45	Very high level	4.41	Very high level	4.42	Very high level	4.43	Very high level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Table 13 showed the level of assessment in the crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the school heads in the Assess phase and when grouped according to highest educational attainment and position title and interpreted as “very high” level. This reflects that knowledge brings about better outputs. School heads are persons expected to be knowledgeable in the crafting process. John (2012) in his study revealed the same findings that school leaders-principals and superintendent, who foster a clear vision that is based on data and created collaboratively with meaningful stakeholder involvement and commitment provide the only way to improvement. They are considerably the key players in the school improvement process.

Table 12 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Assess Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	4.58	Very high level	4.32	Very high level	4.46	Very high level	4.30	Very high level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	4.47	Very high level	4.28	Very high level	4.44	Very high level	4.21	High level
3. Collecting, organizing and	4.74	Very high	4.53	Very high level	4.69	Very high level	4.45	Very high level

analyzing your school data.		level						
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.89	Very high level	4.60	Very high level	4.77	Very high level	4.58	Very high level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.84	Very high level	4.58	Very high level	4.74	Very high level	4.55	Very high level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.58	Very high level	4.58	Very high level	4.64	Very high level	4.52	Very high level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.37	Very high level	4.49	Very high level	4.49	Very high level	4.42	Very high level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	4.42	Very high level	4.34	Very high level	4.41	Very high level	4.30	Very high level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	4.21	High level	3.98	High level	4.05	High level	4.03	High level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	4.32	Very high level	4.15	High level	4.23	High level	4.15	High level
Overall Mean	4.54	Very high level	4.39	Very high level	4.49	Very high level	4.35	Very high level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 13 showed that that level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan in the Assess phase as assessed by the school heads according to average monthly income obtained a descriptive mean rating of “very high level”.

Except for item Nos. 1, 2 and 8 which indicates the calling, orienting and organizing of the planning team and attained only the “moderate level”, the rest of the item numbers were rated as “high level” which entails the active and intensive compliance of the respondent towards the crafting of the SIP being one of their major job as school heads. Mitchell (2014) revealed in his study and corroborated this research findings the importance of instructional leadership for improving student attainment: “the more leaders focus their relationships, their work, and their learning on the core business of teaching and learning, the greater their influence on student outcomes”. Item Nos. 9 and 10 indicating the validating the data through interviews with students and parents and analyzing the school process to the extent of determining the root cause, school heads with higher income rated it as “high level”. The higher compensation accompanying the higher position may serve as one of the possible motivations in completing the expected task.

Table 13 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Assess Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	4.47	Very high level	4.28	Very high level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	4.45	Very high level	4.19	High level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.65	Very high level	4.50	Very high level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.73	Very high level	4.62	Very high level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.70	Very high level	4.59	Very high level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.63	Very high level	4.53	Very high level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.45	Very high level	4.47	Very high level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	4.35	Very high level	4.38	Very high level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.97	High level	4.12	High level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	4.23	Very high level	4.16	High level
Overall Mean	4.46	Very high level	4.38	Very high level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 14 showed that the level of assessment of school heads in the area of Plan phase indicated an overall rating of “very high level”. Hence, it presents the information that school heads regardless of whether they are young or old, male or female are not affected of any issues in facilitating the plan phase, thus the result. Conducting the project monitoring during the middle and end of the implementation, has been rated as “high”. Looking deeper into the item, the study reveals that there was less emphasis on the project monitoring which tells stories on the success and failure of the plan being implemented. Duerden and Witt (2012) in their study assessing program implementation, however, believed that the effective evaluation of both program impacts and evaluation can provide educators with a more holistic perspective of their programs and an increased ability to identify and disseminate best program practices.

Table 14 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Plan Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Me an	Interpreta tion	Me an	Interpreta tion	Mea n	Interpreta tion	Mea n	Interpreta tion
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	4.36	Very high level	4.49	Very high level	4.38	Very high level	4.47	Very high level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	4.15	High level	4.28	Very high level	4.16	High level	4.27	Very high level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	4.52	Very high level	4.49	Very high level	4.34	Very high level	4.62	Very high level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	4.00	High level	4.03	High level	4.06	High level	3.98	High level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.76	Very high level	4.69	Very high level	4.75	Very high level	4.70	Very high level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.70	Very high level	4.77	Very high level	4.66	Very high level	4.80	Very high level
7. Preparing the Annual	4.76	Very high	4.82	Very high level	4.75	Very high level	4.82	Very high level

Implementation Plan.		level						
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	4.33	Very high level	4.41	Very high level	4.31	Very high level	4.42	Very high level
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	4.15	High level	4.46	Very high level	4.22	High level	4.40	Very high level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	4.27	Very high level	4.41	Very high level	4.25	Very high level	4.42	Very high level
Overall Mean	4.40	Very high level	4.48	Very high level	4.39	Very high level	4.49	Very high level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Table 15 revealed the school head's level of assessment on the Plan phase obtained an overall mean rating of "very high level" regardless of their educational attainment and position title.

Item numbers encompasses the major components of the SIP to which the school heads has common knowledge, thus the rating. This simply means that since the plan phase covers mostly the review, brainstorming, Developing Project Work Plan, writing the SIP and the AIP, among others, the valuable knowledge that a School Head serve as their foundation in the crafting process. As the key players in the school improvement process, they play a wide variety of roles to ensure that the improvement plan and its implementation are successful. Thus, the manifestation of their intensive participation. The school head's role in the improvement planning is characterized by: (a) communication (b) leadership and (c) professional development. Assuming the role of a school head, he/she is expected to take total control in the providing the community with the school profile as well as continuous access to the improvement level of the students. However, looking deeper into the project monitoring during the middle and end of the project implementation a very dismal results. Duerden and Witt (2012) further revealed that at the core of implementation is the concept of program integrity, defined as the degree to which a program is implemented as originally planned. Program integrity consists of five main dimensions: adherence, dosage, quality of delivery, participant responsiveness, and program differentiation. Looking at the results of the study, DepEd must institute a culture of authentic monitoring and evaluation in all of its programs and

projects, must develop a culture of being output-oriented where accomplishment reports is a must and be treated as non-negotiable given other tasks on hand.

Table 15 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Plan Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	4.58	Very high level	4.32	Very high level	4.46	Very high level	4.30	Very high level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	4.47	Very high level	4.28	Very high level	4.44	Very high level	4.21	High level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	4.74	Very high level	4.53	Very high level	4.69	Very high level	4.45	Very high level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	4.89	Very high level	4.60	Very high level	4.77	Very high level	4.58	Very high level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.84	Very high level	4.58	Very high level	4.74	Very high level	4.55	Very high level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.58	Very high level	4.58	Very high level	4.64	Very high level	4.52	Very high level
7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	4.37	Very high level	4.49	Very high level	4.49	Very high level	4.42	Very high level
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and	4.42	Very high level	4.34	Very high level	4.41	Very high level	4.30	Very high level

identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.								
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	4.21	High level	3.98	High level	4.05	High level	4.03	High level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	4.32	Very high level	4.15	High level	4.23	High level	4.15	High level
Overall Mean	4.54	Very high level	4.39	Very high level	4.49	Very high level	4.35	Very high level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 16 below expresses the information of school heads in assessing the Plan phase in terms of the average family monthly income and revealed that its overall descriptive mean rating was “very high”. Reasons reflected below are stated in item No. 2 in the Plan phase depicting brainstorming activity and formulating solutions on the root cause. Thus, issues on the competence and sufficient knowledge about the SIP crafting are priority when planning the right people for the right job. However, in item no. 4 prevailing notions of inadequate project monitoring of programs and projects existed.

Table 16 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Assess Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	4.42	Very high level	4.44	Very high level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	4.23	High level	4.22	High level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	4.58	Very high level	4.41	Very high level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by	3.93	High level	4.12	High level

the School Planning Team.					
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.70	Very level	high	4.75	Very level high
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.68	Very level	high	4.81	Very level high
7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	4.75	Very level	high	4.84	Very level high
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	4.27	Very level	high	4.50	Very level high
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	4.27	Very level	high	4.38	Very level high
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	4.32	Very level	high	4.38	Very level high
Overall Mean	4.42	Very level	high	4.48	Very level high

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 17 reflects the data concerning the level of assessment of school heads in the Act phase with an overall descriptive rating of “high level”. Considering the data presented by Table 17, Act phase entails the intensive inspection of what had been crafted, how the crafted form was implemented and what the outcomes are done by the school head. Hence, regardless of young or old, male or female such obligations are not influenced by the variables. Duerden and Witt (2012) revealed in their study that too often, evaluation focus solely on program outcomes without considering how the program and its components actually produced the observed results. A contrast to the results of this study that indicates less interest on finding whether the proposed projects is the right and effective solution. Thus, the result.

Table 17: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Act Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	3.67	High level	3.67	High level	3.78	High level	3.57	High level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three	3.73	High level	3.95	High level	3.84	High level	3.85	High level

(3) years.								
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	4.52	Very high level	4.54	Very high level	4.62	Very high level	4.45	Very high level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	4.61	Very high level	4.69	Very high level	4.69	Very high level	4.63	Very high level
5. Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	3.97	High level	3.82	High level	3.87	High level	3.90	High level
6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	4.00	High level	4.03	High level	3.97	High level	4.05	High level
7. Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	4.18	High level	4.28	Very high level	4.41	Very high level	4.10	High level
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.79	High level	3.87	High level	3.81	High level	3.85	High level
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	3.91	High level	4.10	High level	4.09	High level	3.95	High level
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	4.33	Very high level	4.44	Very high level	4.41	Very high level	4.38	Very high level
Overall Mean	4.07	High level	4.13	High level	4.15	High level	4.07	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Table 18 revealed the level of assessment of school heads when it comes to the Act phase when grouped according to highest educational attainment and position title obtained an overall rating of “high level”. Everyone involved in the crafting process play a significant role in the SIP. The school heads as their position signifies, has the huge responsibility not only in the planning scheme of the SIP but likewise is its implementation. Duerden and Witt (2012) revealed in their study the keys to effective implementation evaluations: uniform operationalized definitions of the program integrity, collection of data from as many of

the core integrity domains as possible, and program and implementation system must be fully described to facilitate accurate effective measurement. In sense, what you cannot measure, you cannot evaluate. However, what is evident in the results the fact that crafting the training plan and other interventions to roll out the solutions of the priority areas were given less attention by the school heads. These explain the data found in Table 18.

Table 18 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Act Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Me an	Interpre ta tion	Me an	Interpre ta tion	Mea n	Interpre ta tion	Mea n	Interpre ta tion
1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	3.84	High level	3.60	High level	3.67	High level	3.67	High level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.89	High level	3.83	High level	3.82	High level	3.88	High level
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	4.74	Very high level	4.45	Very high level	4.49	Very high level	4.58	Very high level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	4.84	Very high level	4.58	Very high level	4.67	Very high level	4.64	Very high level
5. Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	3.95	High level	3.87	High level	3.87	High level	3.91	High level
6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	4.21	High level	3.94	High level	3.95	High level	4.09	High level
7. Communicating successful solution to concerned	4.26	Very high level	4.23	High level	4.21	High level	4.27	Very high level

stakeholders for feedback and support.								
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.68	High level	3.89	High level	3.87	High level	3.79	High level
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	4.16	High level	3.96	High level	4.00	High level	4.03	High level
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	4.47	Very high level	4.36	Very high level	4.31	Very high level	4.48	Very high level
Overall Mean	4.21	High level	4.07	High level	4.08	High level	4.13	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 19 reflects information relative to the level of assessment of school heads in the Act phase with a descriptive rating of “high level”.

These data implies that above the great responsibility of the school head in managing a school includes the large task of taking a close look at the school’s situation come the SIP implementation. Thus, it is expected that they have the thorough knowledge about the needs of the students and the entire school also. The rating of “high level” is an indicator of the school head’s commitment, their core values, their vision and mission through the implementation of the SIP in delivering quality education and improvement of student’s learning potentials. Thus, the results.

Table 19: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Assess Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	3.68	High level	3.66	High level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.85	High level	3.84	High level
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	4.45	Very high level	4.62	Very high level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	4.65	Very high level	4.66	Very high level
5. Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	3.85	High level	3.94	High level

6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	4.02	High level	4.00	High level
7. Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	4.15	High level	4.34	Very high level
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.82	High level	3.84	High level
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	4.02	High level	4.00	High level
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	4.25	Very high level	4.56	Very high level
Overall Mean	4.08	High level	4.15	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 20 showed the overall mean descriptive rating of teacher's level of assessment in the Assess phase according to age and sex was "high level".

In terms of age, the younger ones rated the crafting and processing of SIP as "moderate" while the older teachers rated the 10 items as "high level". In the same way, in terms of sex, conduct of orientation was rated as "moderate" by the male respondents. The issue of being a neophyte in the program compounded by insufficient knowledge about the program which are the reasons of the rating "moderate" in item No. 2. Less exposure to the school's situation has been eyed as one of the reasons that these teachers still cannot relate to the significance of the SIP. In the study conducted by De Luca and Johnson (2017) revealed that within their first five years, beginning teachers work to establish confidence across their practice with explicit professional learning in assessment not always accessible or available. More likely the situation of the respondents which are new to the department.

Such response reflects the little knowledge on item No. 2 that depicts "Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning". Since crafting process is not in their forte nor knowledge about the program is too superficial, negative attitudes are usually displayed with the kind of behavior they are showing. Sad to say, that these results to unreliable output (SIP) and therefore wrong interventions which do not contribute to the progress of the school.

Generally, despite some differences in the response, teachers assessed the Assess phase as "high level".

Table 20: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Assess Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	3.58	High level	3.92	High level	3.70	High level	3.58	High level
2. Orienting your School Planning	3.31	Moderate level	3.86	High level	3.30	Moderate level	3.31	Moderate level

Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.								
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.17	High level	4.22	High level	4.00	High level	4.17	High level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.47	Very high level	4.72	Very high level	4.40	Very high level	4.47	Very high level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.42	Very high level	4.44	Very high level	4.20	High level	4.42	Very high level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.03	High level	4.06	High level	3.80	High level	4.03	High level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	3.89	High level	4.22	High level	3.90	High level	3.89	High level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	3.81	High level	3.89	High level	3.70	High level	3.81	High level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.86	High level	4.08	High level	4.00	High level	3.86	High level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	3.64	High level	4.00	High level	3.50	High level	3.64	High level
Overall Mean	3.92	High level	4.14	High level	3.85	High level	3.92	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Reflected in Table 21 are the information on the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan on the Assess phase of teachers according to their highest educational attainment and position title. It showed that teachers whether with lower or higher educational attainment rated as “high level”.

Responses signify that those teachers regardless of their educational attainment can identify core values and even have the capacity to formulate the vision and mission of the school with the integration of the core values. However, teachers with lower position title are not too competent when it comes to giving orientation of the SIP which subsequently give also the idea that their exposure to educational programs and projects are not too exhaustive given the rating level “high”. Teachers with higher position title are more knowledgeable and can easily rate to the elements of the assess phase, thus rating it as “very high”.

Table 21: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Assess Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	3.72	High level	3.78	High level	3.65	High level	3.92	High level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	3.53	High level	3.62	High level	3.39	Moderate level	3.92	High level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.00	High level	4.35	Very high level	4.13	High level	4.31	Very high level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.41	Very high level	4.75	Very high level	4.43	Very high level	4.88	Very high level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.28	Very high level	4.55	Very high level	4.30	Very high level	4.65	Very high level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	3.91	High level	4.15	High level	3.89	High level	4.31	Very high level

7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	3.94	High level	4.15	High level	3.91	High level	4.31	Very high level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	3.72	High level	3.95	High level	3.72	High level	4.08	High level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.75	High level	4.15	High level	3.80	High level	4.27	Very high level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	3.59	High level	4.00	High level	3.65	High level	4.12	High level
Overall Mean	3.88	High level	4.15	High level	3.89	High level	4.28	Very high level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 22 provides the data on the level of assessment of the teachers according to average family monthly income on the Assess phase which implied the rating of “very high”. In some point Table 22 pointed out that in terms of “Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data”, “Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school”, “Determining your school goals and objectives”, and “Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, Parents and other stakeholders”, teachers with lower income rated them as “very high”.

“The school improvement planning team has the task of analyzing data and information about the level of student achievement in the school, the effectiveness of the school environment, and the level of involvement of parents in their children’s education” (School Improvement Planning Book, p.18). As teachers, particularly those receiving low family income and as one of the members of the School Planning Team can easily grasp the situations of the school as well as that of the parents and stakeholders because in one way or the other they feel the same sentiments. Items 2, 3, 4 and 9 carry the same thoughts. Parents would give everything that is true if it will better the future of their children. As the paragraph says so, such desire of the parents, the teachers, the stakeholders and the community along with the school will be reflected in the SIP. On the part of those teachers with high income, assessing the SIP may mean lesser personal activities which may somehow interfere with their planned family activities, looking at the crafting of SIP as a burden. Thus, the results.

Table 22 : Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Assess Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mea n	Interpretatio n	Mea n	Interpretatio n
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	3.72	High level	3.78	High level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	3.53	High level	3.64	High level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.44	Very high level	3.94	High level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.75	Very high level	4.44	Very high level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.61	Very high level	4.25	Very high level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.14	High level	3.94	High level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.22	High level	3.89	High level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	4.06	High level	3.64	High level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	4.25	Very high level	3.69	High level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	4.11	High level	3.53	High level
Overall Mean	4.18	High level	3.88	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 23 showed the information on the level of assessment of teachers on the Plan phase according to age and sex with an overall mean rating of “high level”. In holistic view point, the data which were reflected in Table 23 entails that older and female teachers find the tasks of “reviewing the general objectives and targets”, “brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams”, “Developing Project Work Plan and budget Matrix by the Project Teams”, “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team”, “Writing the School Improvement Plan”, “Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance”, Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan”, “ Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year and 3rd year’, ”Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP, and “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of AIP and the SIP with the Division goals” as part of the job. On the other hand, younger and male teachers have difficulty on the aspects of “Developing

Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams”, “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team”, “Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year and 3rd year“, “Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP” and “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of AIP and the SIP with the Division goals” because having short years of service, experience wise there is a great difference. Results of the focus group discussion affirms the quantitative results, to mention. SIP is not taken so well in the meeting, other teachers were not aware what is in the SIP.

Table 23: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Plan Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Me an	Interpreta tion	Me an	Interpreta tion	Mea n	Interpreta tion	Mea n	Interpreta tion
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.86	High level	4.03	High level	3.90	High level	3.95	High level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.47	High level	4.00	High level	3.50	High level	3.77	High level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.36	Moderate level	3.89	High level	3.30	Moderate level	3.68	High level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.25	Moderate level	3.86	High level	3.30	Moderate level	3.60	High level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	3.89	High level	4.06	High level	3.90	High level	3.98	High level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	3.97	High level	4.36	Very high level	3.90	High level	4.21	High level
7. Preparing the Annual Implementation	3.86	High level	4.31	Very high level	3.60	High level	4.16	High level

Plan.								
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	3.50	High level	4.08	High level	3.40	Moderate level	3.85	High level
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	3.50	High level	4.03	High level	3.40	Moderate level	3.82	High level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	3.81	High level	4.08	High level	3.40	Moderate level	4.03	High level
Overall Mean	3.65	High level	4.07	High level	3.56	High level	3.90	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Table 24 showed that the level of assessment of School Improvement Plan by the teachers in the Plan phase relative to their highest educational attainment and position title, reflected the overall mean descriptive rating of “high level”.

Specifically, the teachers with lower educational attainment gave the rating of “high level” to item nos. that depict “Reviewing the general objectives and targets”, “Writing the SIP”, “Signing the SIP by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance”, “Preparing the AIP”, and “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of AIP and the SIP with the Division goals” of their school, there is a professional growth that is starting to be enriched. Hence, they have gained some ideas on this matter. However, in some points like “Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams”, “Developing Project Work Plan and Budget matrix by the Project teams”. “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team”, Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year and 3rd year”, and “Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP” which implies that not enough training knowledge was delivered to them. That is why, they could not also provide the necessary information making the SIP a half –baked product. Morrison (2015) revealed however that all throughout his observation of the crafting of the SIP from a linear, prescriptive, and principal-directed exercise to a teacher-and-administrator-led activity that was interactive, emergent, and flexible in nature, seen by many as a “good thing” because of the increased of involvement and decision-making became shared, SIP is still contextually bound and influence by the culture and

language of the crafters. Thus, disproved the results of the findings that not all crafters with higher education can effectively deliver proper disposition in the crafting, and lower position cannot. For teachers with higher educational attainment, all item nos. were proven to be easily grasped by the said teachers specifically in the elements of “Signing the School Improvement plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance”, and in terms of “Preparing the AIP”, somehow it show that teachers who are up-dated with changes and improvements in the educational field and likewise focused and committed to their work, never put any barriers that would hinder their dedication to work at stake.

Meanwhile teachers with lower position title rated all items as “high level” in consonance with teachers having high position title. Item Nos. 6 and 7 that depicts “Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance” and “Preparing the AIP” were rated by teachers having higher position title as “very high level”.

Table 24: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Plan Phase and When

Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Plan Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.66	High level	4.17	High level	3.83	High level	4.15	High level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.34	Moderate level	4.05	High level	3.54	High level	4.08	High level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.19	Moderate level	3.98	High level	3.50	High level	3.85	High level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.41	Moderate level	3.68	High level	3.43	High level	3.77	High level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	3.84	High level	4.07	High level	3.83	High level	4.23	High level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the	3.97	High level	4.32	Very high level	4.00	High level	4.46	Very high level

Division Office for review and acceptance.								
7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	3.81	High level	4.30	Very high level	3.87	High level	4.46	Very high level
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	3.41	Moderate level	4.10	High level	3.57	High level	4.19	High level
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	3.38	Moderate level	4.07	High level	3.54	High level	4.15	High level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	3.75	High level	4.10	High level	3.87	High level	4.08	High level
Overall Mean	3.58	High level	4.09	High level	3.70	High level	4.14	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 25 contains the level of assessment of School Improvement Plan as assessed by teachers on Plan phase according to their family monthly income and obtained an overall rating of “high level”. However, data are interpreted as that teachers with lower income has rated “high level” on the aspects of “Reviewing the general objectives and targets”, “Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams”, “Developing project Work Plan and Budget matrix by the Project Teams”, “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team”, “Writing the SIP”, “Revisiting the AIP (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year and 3rd year”, and “Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP”. While higher income teachers rated “moderate level” items such as “Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause”, “Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix”, and “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of the implementation period by the School Planning Team”. Basically, high income teachers have resources for family and other social gatherings and thus, school activities other than the actual teaching is received with moderate enthusiasm. Thus, the results.

Table 25: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Plan Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	4.25	High level	3.64	High level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	4.08	High level	3.39	Moderate level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	4.08	High level	3.17	Moderate level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.75	High level	3.36	Moderate level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.17	High level	3.78	High level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.39	Very high level	3.94	High level
7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	4.28	Very high level	3.89	High level
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	4.06	High level	3.53	High level
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	4.06	High level	3.47	High level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	4.14	Very high level	3.75	High level
Overall Mean	4.13	High level	3.59	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 26 brings the information about the level of assessment of the teachers in the Act phase of the SIP which indicates that teachers gave a rating of “high level” regardless of their sex and age.

Younger teachers rated item Nos. 1, 6, 8, 9 and 10 that depicts the “Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as Solutions”, “Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done”, “Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.”, “Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary”, and “Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle” as “moderate level”.

Unfortunately, since they are still young in service, these teachers are not expected to deal deeply in the crafting of SIP particularly in areas indicated by the mentioned items. Although, intensive manifestations in exercising the core values, vision, and mission has been rated “very high” by both teachers (young or old) considering that such can be integrated in the subjects they were teaching. On the other hand, male teachers rated item Nos. 1 and 9 depicting “Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as Solutions” and

“Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary” as “moderate.

An effective SIP results when principals along with the planning team, the parents, stakeholders really work as a team in establishing priorities, set goals for improvement and implement strategies to achieve those goals, and evaluate progress. If is violated, one cannot produce a quality SIP. In this aspect, it shows that even teachers may find a hard time testing and reviewing projects designs or make some revisions on the proposal if there is a need to do so since they feel the incompetence on their part. Thus, they allow their female partners to do the tasks. Meanwhile their female partners has the ability in transmitting the possible solutions to the community hence the rating in item no. 7 as “very high level”. Yet, if taking into detail the responses of these female teachers, it would disclose the fact that not all of them may have the competence to do the job with quality and so it ends again in a half-baked output.

Table 26: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Act Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	3.36	Moderate level	3.97	High level	3.20	Moderate level	3.74	High level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.72	High level	4.08	High level	3.90	High level	3.90	High level
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	3.89	High level	4.00	High level	3.80	High level	3.97	High level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	4.42	Very high level	4.58	Very high level	4.50	Very high level	4.50	Very high level
5. Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	3.78	High level	4.22	High level	3.90	High level	4.02	High level
6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	3.39	Moderate level	4.06	High level	3.50	High level	3.76	High level
7. Communicating successful solution	3.53	High level	4.08	High level	3.60	High level	3.84	High level

to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.									
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.39	Moderate level	3.86	High level	3.60	High level	3.63	High level	
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	3.28	Moderate level	3.78	High level	3.20	Moderate level	3.58	High level	
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	3.39	Moderate level	3.94	High level	3.80	High level	3.65	High level	
Overall Mean	3.61	High level	4.06	High level	3.70	High level	3.86	High level	

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Based from the data reflected in Table 27, the level of assessment of SIP by the teachers on the Act phase relative to their educational attainment and position title imply the overall mean rating of “high level”. From the data also reflect that teachers regardless of whether they have lower or higher educational attainment and whether they have lower or higher position title bears a similarities in their responses. However, hundred percent of their responses on item No. 4 rated “very high level” depicting “Exercising the core values, vision, and mission”.

Aside from indulging in the teaching-learning processes, teachers are expected to engage in activity geared towards improving their student’s achievement level and these are usually dependent on how much their potentials has been enriched with consistent post graduate studies. More so when the teachers are promoted to a position where he/she is more exposed to trainings, conferences geared towards improving his/her perspectives about education. Armed with these competence, a teacher can contribute much on the SIP. Data presented however, that teachers are more sensitive in actualizing values integrated in the Vision and Mission of education but has to enhance more their knowledge when it comes to planning and providing innovations or interventions to existing school problem of which improvement of the school and student is included. It comes to the reality that from the start, the School Improvement Plan has not been fully understood by teachers.

Table 27: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Act Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation

1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	3.44	High level	3.85	High level	3.59	High level	3.81	High level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.78	High level	4.00	High level	3.78	High level	4.12	High level
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	3.87	High level	4.00	High level	3.87	High level	4.08	High level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	4.44	Very high level	4.55	Very high level	4.46	Very high level	4.58	Very high level
5. Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	3.84	High level	4.12	High level	3.87	High level	4.23	High level
6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	3.59	High level	3.83	High level	3.57	High level	4.00	High level
7. Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	3.75	High level	3.85	High level	3.61	High level	4.15	High level
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.59	High level	3.65	High level	3.52	High level	3.81	High level
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	3.59	High level	3.48	High level	3.43	High level	3.69	High level
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	3.66	High level	3.67	High level	3.54	High level	3.88	High level
Overall Mean	3.76	High level	3.90	High level	3.72	High level	4.03	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Considering the data presented by Table 28 with regards to the level of assessment on the Act phase disclosed that teachers regardless of whether they have lower or higher family income, has an overall descriptive rating of “high level”.

The data reflects that commitment ranks first more than anything else. Except for item No. 4, which was rated as “very high level”, all items depicts the reality that teachers although not all also need training knowledge in order to work out appropriate strategies to make sure that they too understands his or her role in fulfilling the plan. It is too frightening to note that it is not only the parents or stakeholders or community that cannot define their significance in SIP crafting but likewise teachers share the same fate too basing from the data that were retrieved. Considerably, teachers are the one that brings more information with regards to what they do to increase their student’s achievement level and from these information, goals are set and defined. They are the ones that provide the up-to-date information on student learning, the school environment, and parental feedback which entails huge workloads aside from their teaching job and is seen to be one of the elements responsible for their ratings. In some cases, reasons can be personal (attitudes, beliefs, values, economic status).

Table 28: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Act Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	3.89	High level	3.44	High level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.97	High level	3.83	High level
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	4.00	High level	3.89	High level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	4.72	Very high level	4.28	Very high level
5. Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	4.11	High level	3.89	High level
6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	3.81	High level	3.64	High level
7. Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	3.83	High level	3.78	High level
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.72	High level	3.53	High level
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	3.44	High level	3.61	High level
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	3.61	High level	3.72	High level
Overall Mean	3.91	High level	3.76	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 29 provides evidences that the parents’ level of assessment of the SIP on the Assess phase relative to their age and sex has an overall mean rating described as “high level”. Considerable observations are given to item No. 2 depicting “Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning” and item No. 8 depicting “Organizing your teams for Implementation” which were rated as “moderate” by the male and female parents as well as younger parents.

Based from these information, there is still a need for school parent to be provided with sufficient knowledge on the nature of SIP so that they can deliver training knowledge for other members for better implementation of the program. Moreover, the male parents rated item Nos. 9 and 10 “moderate level” that denotes “Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other Stakeholders” and “Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas”. The results are contrary to the study conducted by Cabardo (2016) entitled “Levels of Participation of the School Stakeholders to the Different School-Initiated Activities and the Implementation of School-Based Management”, stating that strengthening the relationships among school, family and community bring a positive impact on student’s achievement since the collaboration of the three groups allow them to discuss matters concerning the performance in school and any flaws on this aspect can easily be identified and resolved. At this point then, there is already the perspectives that the parents whether young or old, male or female must be enriched with adequate knowledge about the SIP so that implementation process will be of good quality.

Table 29: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Assess Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	3.42	High level	3.44	High level	3.18	Moderate level	3.54	High level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	3.17	Moderate level	3.42	Moderate level	3.09	Moderate level	3.38	Moderate level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	3.61	High level	3.81	High level	3.64	High level	3.74	High level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the	4.11	High level	4.14	High level	4.05	High level	4.16	High level

vision and mission of your school.								
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	3.78	High level	4.08	High level	4.00	High level	3.90	High level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	3.50	High level	3.89	High level	3.82	High level	3.64	High level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	3.47	High level	3.92	High level	3.77	High level	3.66	High level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	3.22	Moderate level	3.64	High level	3.50	High level	3.40	Moderate level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.50	High level	3.64	High level	3.32	Moderate level	3.68	High level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	3.42	Moderate level	3.53	High level	3.36	Moderate level	3.52	High level
Overall Mean	3.52	High level	3.75	High level	3.57	High level	3.66	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Table 30 revealed the level of assessment of SIP by the parents on the Assess phase relative to their highest educational attainment and position title and disclosed that overall mean descriptive rating was “high level”. Specifically, parents regardless of their educational attainment and position title educational attainment rated item No. 2, denoting “Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning” as “moderate”. These suggests that parents know little about the SIP and how it will be implemented, thus has the feeling that they cannot provide sufficient knowledge to others during the assembly or if they will questioned regarding the program. As revealed by Hofosha (2012) similar issues were also encountered in the conduct of the crafting of the SIP. Issues ranging from low coordination of

school community, lack of experience and skills among school principals, and inadequate participation of the stakeholders which implies that SIP crafting is everyone’s business. Item Nos. 1, 8 and 10 were also rated as “moderate” by the parents with low educational attainment. These entails also that in terms of “Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team”, “Organizing your teams for Implementation” and “Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas” these parents are not confident whether they can provide quality training knowledge to others due to insufficient knowledge. These parents are found to be of “very high level” when exercising core values are concerned. Parents with lower position title manifests “moderate level” in terms of “Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team”, with the reason that just like other parents, they have limited knowledge on SIP implementation.

Table 30: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Assess Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	3.24	Moderate level	3.56	High level	3.47	High level	3.37	Moderate level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	3.31	Moderate level	3.28	Moderate level	3.29	Moderate level	3.30	Moderate level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	3.59	High level	3.79	High level	3.69	High level	3.74	High level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.31	Very high level	4.00	High level	4.20	High level	4.00	High level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.07	High level	3.84	High level	3.89	High level	4.00	High level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	3.52	High level	3.81	High level	3.56	High level	3.93	High level
7. Analyzing the Priority	3.62	High level	3.74	High level	3.51	High level	4.00	High level

Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.								
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	3.41	Moderate level	3.44	High level	3.31	Moderate level	3.63	High level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.55	High level	3.58	High level	3.53	High level	3.63	High level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	3.41	Moderate level	3.51	High level	3.42	Moderate level	3.56	High level
Overall Mean	3.60	High level	3.66	High level	3.59	High level	3.71	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 31 showed that with regards to the level of assessment of parents in the Assess phase relative to their average family income indicated the overall mean rating of “high level”. Although low income parents rated “moderate” in terms of “Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team”, “Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning” and “Organizing your teams for Implementation”, the data entails the domino effect of lack of proper training and orientation of the school to SIP implementation. Compare to parents with higher family income, where they rated all items as “high level”. Scholars and researchers asserted that parental and community participation in schools has produced more effective schools and improved student achievements (Cabardo, 2016). He further claimed that the Key Reform Thrust of BESRA called School-Based Management (SBM) empowers the key stakeholders in school communities to motivate them to be active in their participation to activities that would promote higher pupil/student learning outcomes. Hence from the data indicated in Table 31 is the realization that parents are supposedly enriched with information about SIP and participate in its related activities so that their children will attain high achievement level.

Table 31: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Assess Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation

1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	3.33	Moderate level	3.65	High level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	3.20	Moderate level	3.48	High level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	3.69	High level	3.74	High level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.20	High level	3.96	High level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	3.98	High level	3.83	High level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	3.69	High level	3.70	High level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	3.73	High level	3.61	High level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	3.39	Moderate level	3.52	High level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.55	High level	3.61	High level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	3.45	High level	3.52	High level
Overall Mean	3.62	High level	3.66	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 32 revealed level of assessment in the Plan phase relative to their age and sex. Overall rating of the study revealed “moderate” for younger parents, the male and female parents. While older parents rated the area of Plan phase as “high level”.

It is to be noted that in terms of “Reviewing the general objectives and targets”, “Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams”, “Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams”, “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team”, “Writing the School Improvement Plan”, “Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year and 3rd year”, “Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP”, and “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals”, parents gave a rating of “moderate” implying that these aspects which requires deep thought and thorough understanding of the nature of their work were not too easy for the parents who are young and have less exposure to these kind of work. Rated item Nos. 3, 4, 8, 9 and 10 where it depicts about “developing project work plan”, monitoring tasks, revisiting AIP (previous and current years), recording tasks and in checking the alignment of the objectives as “moderate level” which suggests the probability that the school have not delivered the appropriate and adequate training knowledge for them, thus, the results.

Male parents finds “Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams” along with “Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams”, “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team”, “Revisiting

the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year and 3rd year”, “Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP” and “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals” being rated as “moderate level” also. In the same way, the female parents share the same perspectives. These information connotes that majority of the parents involved in the crafting of SIP may have limited knowledge resulting sometimes of the inability to capture the true essence of the SIP on the progress of the school and the students’ achievement as well. As in the case of the study of Hanover Research (2014) revealed that following a comprehensive needs assessment on the part of the school, principal must establish attainable goals so as not to demoralize parents and opt not to participate in the process. This confirms the researcher’s observation of less enthusiasm on the part of parents.

Table 32: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Plan Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.39	Moderate level	3.69	High level	3.59	High level	3.52	High level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.42	Moderate level	3.44	High level	3.18	Moderate level	3.54	High level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.33	Moderate level	3.39	Moderate level	3.23	Moderate level	3.42	Moderate level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	2.86	Moderate level	3.28	Moderate level	3.05	Moderate level	3.08	Moderate level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	3.69	High level	3.89	High level	3.59	High level	3.88	High level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	3.58	High level	3.86	High level	3.68	High level	3.74	High level

7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	3.56	High level	3.83	High level	3.59	High level	3.74	High level
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	2.81	Moderate level	3.25	Moderate level	3.09	Moderate level	3.00	Moderate level
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	2.78	Moderate level	3.19	Moderate level	3.00	Moderate level	2.98	Moderate level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	3.06	Moderate level	3.31	Moderate level	3.27	Moderate level	3.14	Moderate level
Overall Mean	3.25	Moderate level	3.51	High level	3.33	Moderate level	3.40	Moderate level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Table 33 presents the level of assessment of parents on the Plan phase relative to their educational attainment and position title revealed that those with lower and higher educational attainment and with lower position title gave an overall rating of “moderate level” whereas parents with higher position title rated the plan phase as “high level”.

Ladjahali (2016) gave the perspectives that collaborative participation of stakeholders bring about the crafting of a comprehensive SIP. As the data suggests poor knowledge of the respondents (parents) in the field of “Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix”, “Conducting project monitoring”, “Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year and 3rd year”, “Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP” and in “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals” triggered them to rate these elements as “moderate”. Such gestures of these parents is a manifestation that there is a need for them to undergo series of trainings before getting into the job. Contrary to the data, is the overall rating given by parents with high position title. Obviously, those who are in consistent experience with these kind of tasks are likely the ones which could provide the needed data as reflected by the said respondents. In the study conducted by Ladjahali (2016), results showed that the finished SIP output showed only single signature of the School head and no apparent signature of other

people were involved. The SIP produced by the school found to have inconsistent activities conducted and improvement on student's achievement level was unsatisfactory. Parents' participation must be stimulated in order to provide coherent effort for school improvement.

Table 33: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Plan Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.48	High level	3.58	High level	3.42	Moderate level	3.74	High level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.38	Moderate level	3.47	High level	3.38	Moderate level	3.52	High level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.38	Moderate level	3.35	Moderate level	3.31	Moderate level	3.44	High level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.07	Moderate level	3.07	Moderate level	3.04	Moderate level	3.11	Moderate level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.10	High level	3.58	High level	3.78	High level	3.81	High level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	3.90	High level	3.60	High level	3.80	High level	3.59	High level
7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	3.93	High level	3.53	High level	3.60	High level	3.85	High level
8. Revisiting the Annual	2.90	Moderate level	3.12	Moderate level	2.91	Moderate level	3.22	Moderate level

Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.								
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	2.69	Moderate level	3.19	Moderate level	2.73	Moderate level	3.41	Moderate level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	3.00	Moderate level	3.30	Moderate level	3.07	Moderate level	3.37	Moderate level
Overall Mean	3.38	Moderate level	3.38	Moderate level	3.30	Moderate level	3.51	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 34 portrays the overall mean descriptive rating of “moderate level” given by the parents on the Plan phase relative to their average family monthly income.

The information explains that parents whether receiving a low or high monthly income has a unified ratings of “moderate” specifically in “Brainstorming and formulating solutions” (item No. 2), “Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix”(item No. 3),” Conducting project monitoring “(item no. 4),” Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan”(item No. 8),” “Recording the facilitating factors”(item No. 9), and “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals”(item No. 10). The data further reveal that when it comes to formulation or crafting process, the parents even with high family income could not grasp the process and with the idea that they failed to conceive the ways by which it can possibly lead to better learning outcomes . Henceforth, these aspects will become barriers if not treated accordingly by the school and the community.

Table 34: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Plan Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.53	High level	3.57	High level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.41	Moderate level	3.48	High level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.41	Moderate level	3.26	Moderate level

4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	2.98	Moderate level	3.26	Moderate level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	3.88	High level	3.61	High level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	3.76	High level	3.65	High level
7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	3.78	High level	3.52	High level
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	2.98	Moderate level	3.13	Moderate level
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	2.92	Moderate level	3.13	Moderate level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	3.18	Moderate level	3.17	Moderate level
Overall Mean	3.38	Moderate level	3.38	Moderate level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 35 revealed the common overall mean descriptive ratings of “moderate level” in the area of Act phase by the parents regardless of their age and sex.

As indicated, parents who are young rated item Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 that depicts “Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions”, “Recording effective practices”, “determining the attained and unattained targets”, “Comparing results before and after testing the solution”, “Revisiting implementation process”, “Communicating successful solution”, “Crafting training plan and other interventions”, “Reviewing of the implementing structure” and “Planning for the preparation of SIP “ as “moderate level”. Hall and Hord (2011) had emphasized the lack of data analysis techniques is blatant in the results gathered. Hence, the group finds the tasks difficult and thereby provided a ‘moderate’ assessment in some way, there is still a need for the school to take a close look on the potentials of the parents as members of the Planning Team to avoid poor crafting of SIP. Unfortunately, based on the data gathered, it also revealed that older parents have the same rating as that of the younger ones. Parham (2015) pinpointed in his study entitled “Data Driven Decision Making for School Improvement Planning: Toward a Model and Process for Distributive Leadership and Shared Decision Making” that in some schools, the need for a culture change seems to be one of the absolute reason to improve school’s condition as well as that of the student’s achievement level. This perspectives is in support to the data presented by Table 35. Unless a change in viewpoint and practices will take place, there would be no comprehensive SIP that will be produced. These holistic perspectives hold true also with the ratings given by the male and female parents. In addition, factors like lack of training knowledge, low interests to do the job can be eyed as part of the reasons.

Table 35: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Act Phase	Age	Sex
-----------	-----	-----

	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	2.92	Moderate level	3.06	Moderate level	2.86	Moderate level	3.04	Moderate level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.08	Moderate level	3.17	Moderate level	2.91	Moderate level	3.22	Moderate level
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	3.06	Moderate level	3.19	Moderate level	3.00	Moderate level	3.18	Moderate level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	3.64	High level	3.72	High level	3.73	High level	3.66	High level
5. Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	2.86	Moderate level	3.08	Moderate level	2.82	Moderate level	3.04	Moderate level
6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	2.75	Moderate level	2.97	Moderate level	2.73	Moderate level	2.92	Moderate level
7. Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	3.06	Moderate level	3.19	Moderate level	3.14	Moderate level	3.12	Moderate level
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	2.92	Moderate level	2.89	Moderate level	2.91	Moderate level	2.90	Moderate level
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	2.86	Moderate level	3.14	Moderate level	3.05	Moderate level	2.98	Moderate level
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next	2.97	Moderate level	3.28	Moderate level	3.14	Moderate level	3.12	Moderate level

cycle.								
Overall Mean	3.01	Moderate level	3.17	Moderate level	3.03	Moderate level	3.12	Moderate level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Table 36 showed the level of assessment of parents in the Act phase relative to their highest educational attainment and position title indicated the overall rating of “moderate level”.

Ettinger (2015) in his study entitled “Shifting from a Plan to a Process: School Improvement Plans in the Cambridge Public Schools Doctor of Education Leadership” suggested that after the implementation of SIP in the identified schools, it is clear that only Principals were excited of the positive results than their teachers which entails that such agenda on-going in their schools have not reached the classroom levels of teachers. Consequently, a gap between the variables involved in the study when it comes to SIP had been recognized to be one of the reasons of school’s passive attitudes towards the program. Thus, the recommendations of “internal and external accountabilities of concerned people. Furthermore, going in details about the item nos. where stakeholders rated “high level” comment only for “exercising the core values stipulated in the Vision and Mission of the school. Obviously, fostering positive values to our children has been harnessed by the school, and the people surrounding it, thus the gestures.

Table 36: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Act Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as Solutions	2.72	Moderate level	3.16	Moderate level	2.96	Moderate level	3.04	Moderate level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.10	Moderate level	3.14	Moderate level	3.11	Moderate level	3.15	Moderate level
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	3.00	Moderate level	3.21	Moderate level	3.04	Moderate level	3.26	Moderate level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	3.86	High level	3.56	High level	3.89	High level	3.33	Moderate level
5. Comparing results before and	2.83	Moderate level	3.07	Moderate level	2.98	Moderate level	2.96	Moderate level

after testing the solution.								
6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	2.76	Moderate level	2.93	Moderate level	2.82	Moderate level	2.93	Moderate level
7. Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	2.93	Moderate level	3.26	Moderate level	3.07	Moderate level	3.22	Moderate level
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	2.66	Moderate level	3.07	Moderate level	2.80	Moderate level	3.07	Moderate level
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	2.83	Moderate level	3.12	Moderate level	2.89	Moderate level	3.19	Moderate level
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	3.00	Moderate level	3.21	Moderate level	3.07	Moderate level	3.22	Moderate level
Overall Mean	2.97	Moderate level	3.17	Moderate level	3.06	Moderate level	3.14	Moderate level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 37 portrays the level of assessment of parents on the Act phase relative to their monthly income and evidently revealed as “moderate level”.

With reference to the data collected from Table 37 discloses that parents whether with low or high monthly income showed the lack of competence with regards to “Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions”, “Recording effective practices”, “Determining which targets were attained and not attained”, “Comparing results before and after testing the solution”, “Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done”, “Communicating successful solution to concerned parents for feedback and support”, “Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions”, “Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary” and “Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle”. Parents play a great role in the school and student’s improvement. Nevertheless, they should be given adequate training knowledge to be able to understand the nature and role of the SIP in such improvements. Inadequacy on these elements results to unreliable outputs that may lead to effective SIP.

Ladjahali (2016) emphasized and as delineated in the 2004 U.S. Department of Education guidance that school improvement plan desires to take necessary actions with regards to augmenting the stakeholder’s participation and support to SIP by making changes in the manner they support student’s activities either through helping their kids in their assignment or supporting the school’s programs and projects for the

betterment of the students' achievements. Empowerment is the key answer to the deficiency in implementing SIP to every school in the entire country.

Table 37: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Act Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	2.90	Moderate level	3.17	Moderate level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.08	Moderate level	3.22	Moderate level
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	3.10	Moderate level	3.17	Moderate level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	3.78	High level	3.48	High level
5. Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	2.96	Moderate level	3.00	Moderate level
6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	2.76	Moderate level	3.09	Moderate level
7. Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	3.16	Moderate level	3.04	Moderate level
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	2.88	Moderate level	2.96	Moderate level
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	3.00	Moderate level	3.00	Moderate level
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	3.08	Moderate level	3.22	Moderate level
Overall Mean	3.07	Moderate level	3.13	Moderate level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

LGU assessment on the Assess phase indicated in Table 38 gave a rating of “very high level” in young and male LGU representatives. While LGU who are older and female rated it as “high level”.

School Improvement Plan formulation has a crucial steps that help the school along with the planning team to work on analyzing the data and help monitor the progress of students and the school. Another concept to hold on is that collaborative efforts can bring good results. Psychological aspect of an individual supports the tendency for young or male LGU’s to rate the assess phase as of “very high level” since they have the impetus to cooperate and collaborate with the school without being anxious with time, schedule and personal matters to worry. Meanwhile, LGU who are older and female has the tendency to pass over the tasks to younger ones. Most of these group assume the role of being a part of the school’s project because of personal issues and not because they are needed by the school. Thus, reflects the data. Moreover, the issue of

culture change and “readiness” of school as well as the community and stakeholders to accept the change can take a gradual pace. The probability that such transition is still on-going answers the data they have reflected in this table.

Table 38: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Assess Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	4.50	Very high level	4.23	High level	4.54	Very high level	4.17	High level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	4.33	Very high level	4.23	High level	4.38	Very high level	4.17	High level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.33	Very high level	4.31	Very high level	4.38	Very high level	4.25	Very high level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.67	Very high level	4.46	Very high level	4.77	Very high level	4.33	Very high level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.67	Very high level	4.38	Very high level	4.69	Very high level	4.33	Very high level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.58	Very high level	4.23	High level	4.54	Very high level	4.25	Very high level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.50	Very high level	4.15	High level	4.54	Very high level	4.08	High level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	4.17	High level	4.08	High level	4.31	Very high level	3.92	High level
9. Validating the	4.17	High	4.1	High	4.23	High	4.08	High

data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.		level	5	level		level		level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	4.25	Very high level	4.00	High level	4.38	Very high level	3.83	High level
Overall Mean	4.42	Very high level	4.22	High level	4.48	Very high level	4.14	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Table 39 showed that those LGU representatives with higher position title and whatever highest educational attainment he/she had eventually have the overall mean rating of “very high level” compare to the LGU with lower position title that attained the rating of “high level”.

School activities are conceptualized and put into actions believing that by doing so, it becomes an experiential learning to students that would improve their learning. This school’s paradigm are structured in a way that it also seeks the support of the stakeholders including the local government. The study of Bottoms and Davis (2010) revealed that while the Division office must create the right vision and support system for school improvement, they cannot be expected to act alone. State department must build capacity, help develop coherent vision and hold themselves accountable for the results of the school improvement plan. LGUs with educational attainment (whether high or low) and with high position title includes people who are knowledgeable and have the competence to do the tasks such as the SIP in a manner it is expected to be accomplished. In addition, these knowledge is further enriched with the bimonthly meeting of the parents, involvement in school’s projects and programs which even with educational attainment and high position title can understand. Exempted in the situation are LGUs with low position title for several reasons: more focus is given to finding “greener pastures” for the family, and low interest to mention a few. Fortunately, most of the indicators were rated as “high” and “very high level” indicative that they have the skills to do and perform the tasks expected from them.

Table 39: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Assess Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation

1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	4.20	High level	4.47	Very high level	4.17	High level	4.54	Very high level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	4.10	High level	4.40	Very high level	4.08	High level	4.46	Very high level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.30	Very high level	4.33	Very high level	4.17	High level	4.46	Very high level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.80	Very high level	4.40	Very high level	4.25	Very high level	4.85	Very high level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.70	Very high level	4.40	Very high level	4.17	High level	4.85	Very high level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.40	Very high level	4.40	Very high level	4.08	High level	4.69	Very high level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.40	Very high level	4.27	Very high level	4.00	High level	4.62	Very high level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	4.10	High level	4.13	High level	3.83	High level	4.38	Very high level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	4.10	High level	4.20	High level	3.92	High level	4.38	Very high level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of	4.20	High level	4.07	High level	3.83	High level	4.38	Very high level

focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.								
Overall Mean	4.33	Very high level	4.31	Very high level	4.05	High level	4.56	Very high level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 40 showed that the level of assessment in Assess phase rated “high level” for lower monthly income LGU representatives while ratings of “very high level” for the higher monthly income. Six out of 10 indicators were rated by the low income respondents as “high level” These indicators imply “Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team”, “Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data”, “Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders”. On the other hand, 9 out of 10 item –indicators were rated as “very high level” by the LGU representatives which resulted to overall rating of “very high level”. Only in the item No. 8 that depicts “Organizing your teams for Implementation” did the LGU representative rated it as “high level”. It is thought that LGU representatives find it very difficult to be serious because of different concerns, time schedule and interests to be grouped together for others would regard such meeting as another required school activity for recording purposes. Hence, the results. As in the case of those with low income, the manifestations of being cooperative and of much concern to better their children’s performance in school can be sensed, that is why, even with slight knowledge, their presence in every school activity can be observed.

Table 40: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Assess Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Assess Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	4.20	High level	4.47	Very high level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	4.00	High level	4.47	Very high level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	4.10	High level	4.47	Very high level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.80	Very high level	4.40	Very high level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	4.60	Very high level	4.47	Very high level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	4.30	Very high level	4.47	Very high level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	4.30	Very high level	4.33	Very high level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	4.00	High level	4.20	High level

9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	4.00	High level	4.27	Very high level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	3.90	High level	4.27	Very high level
Overall Mean	4.22	High level	4.38	Very high level

Level of Assessment In Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 41 portrays the level of assessment of LGU representatives in the Plan phase relative to their age and sex. Based from the mentioned table, it revealed that overall mean rating regardless of age and sex proved to be in “high level”.

Item No. 6 that depicts “Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance” was rated “very high Level” by the respondents. It showed the cooperation of the group for the affirmation of the SIP implementation. In addition item No.10 that depicts “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals” was rated “moderate level”. This item calls for analyzing whether there is an alignment between the target goals and that of the Division goals to which the LGU if they had not been given the proper orientation about the purpose of SIP, they could not produce a well-defined SIP.

For the older LGU representatives, they made a rating of “very high level” in item Nos. 5 and 6 depicting “Writing the School Improvement Plan”, “Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance” and “Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan”. Such rating implied that older LGUs (experience-wise) have more knowledge on this matter compared to young ones. (Parham, 2015). From these group of people had already developed the value of data as reference for decision-making. Parham (2015) acknowledged that as these data had been exposed to them during the orientation, they have understood its value and the significance of their role in SIP.

The same holds true on the part of the male and female LGUs where the researcher can say they have the adherence to see the school and the students improved in their level.

Table 41: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Plan Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.83	High level	4.00	High level	4.08	High level	3.75	High level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.75	High level	4.00	High level	3.92	High level	3.83	High level

3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.75	High level	3.92	High level	3.77	High level	3.92	High level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.50	High level	3.62	High level	3.69	High level	3.42	Moderate level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.08	High level	4.31	Very high level	4.08	High level	4.33	Very high level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.33	Very high level	4.62	Very high level	4.46	Very high level	4.50	Very high level
7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	4.08		4.38	Very high level	4.23		4.25	Very high level
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	3.50	High level	3.69	High level	3.69	High level	3.50	High level
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	3.58	High level	3.77	High level	3.85	High level	3.50	High level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan	3.42	Moderate level	3.77	High level	3.62	High level	3.58	High level

with the Division goals.								
Overall Mean	3.78	High level	4.01	High level	3.94	High level	3.86	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU representatives in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Table 42 disclosed the level of assessment of LGU representatives in the Plan phase according to highest educational attainment and position title rated uniformly as “high level”.

Specifically, item No. 6 that states” Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance”, was rated “very high level” signifying such tasks were always obviously being done regularly. The rest of the indicators were rated as “high level” by those with low educational attainment which also connotes that little expertise is still needed to be able to arrive at satisfactory “Very high Level”. Item No.4 depicting “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team”, item No. 8 depicting “Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year”, and item No. 10 stating “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals were rated as “ moderate level” by LGUs with higher educational attainment. These data entails the need for good orientation and preparation of necessary plan and matrix to be able to cope with monitoring, and in identifying the accomplished and unaccomplished programs indicated by the SIP. Bottoms and Davis (2010) further revealed that engaging parents and the larger community, that is the LGU in on-going dialogue about the need to create common vision for school improvement. Not involving them would mean less support in the crafting as shown in the results of the study.

LGUs with high educational attainment gained a rating of “moderate level” in item no. 4 stipulating “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team”, item no.8, “Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year and 3rd year” and item No. 10 that says” Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.” These data infers the follow-up schemes of the SIP implementation. However, these were also the tasks that LGUs could not really come to perfection for several reasons like: lack of necessary training knowledge of the group or poor attendance during the meeting by the LGUs, time constraints, and poor information dissemination.

LGUs with high position title has rated “very high level” level” the item No. 6 stipulating the “Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance” because of the necessity of their obligation. Whether they have fully understood the said task, doesn’t matter as long as they have the accomplishments.

Table 42: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU representatives in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Plan Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	4.20	High level	3.73	High level	3.67	High level	4.15	High level

2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.90	High level	3.87	High level	3.67	High level	4.08	High level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.70	High level	3.93	High level	3.67	High level	4.00	High level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.80	High level	3.40	Moderate level	3.25	Moderate level	3.85	High level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.10	High level	4.27	Very high level	4.25	Very high level	4.15	High level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.60	Very high level	4.40	Very high level	4.67	Very high level	4.31	Very high level
7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	4.30	Very high level	4.20	High level	4.42	Very high level	4.08	High level
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	4.00	High level	3.33	Moderate level	3.25	Moderate level	3.92	High level
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	4.00	High level	3.47	High level	3.58	High level	3.77	High level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives	3.90	High level	3.40	Moderate level	3.42	Moderate level	3.77	High level

and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.								
Overall Mean	4.05	High level	3.80	High level	3.78	High level	4.01	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Table 43 showed the level of assessment of LGU representatives in the Plan phase relative to their monthly income indicated the rating of “high level” for both the lower and higher monthly income receivers. Specifically, “Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team” (item No. 4) and “Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals “ (item No. 10) were rated as “moderate level”. Indeed, the monitoring and checking schemes were rated as “moderate level” by the LGUs since such tasks requires more time which might be in conflict with their personal schedule or can be poor collaboration with the school which leads them to low interest and participation to school programs and projects by low income receivers. Meanwhile, those who receives high income per month are likely to rate indicators 1 to 10 as “high level” which concerns on “Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance” which is self-explanatory. In all indicators, the LGU representatives proves too willing to sign the SIP and AIP as indicated in the “very high level” results of assessment.

Table 43: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Plan Phase and When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Plan Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Reviewing the general objectives and targets.	3.90	High level	3.93	High level
2. Brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams.	3.70	High level	4.00	High level
3. Developing Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams.	3.70	High level	3.93	High level
4. Conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team.	3.40	Moderate level	3.67	High level
5. Writing the School Improvement Plan.	4.20	High level	4.20	High level
6. Signing the School Improvement Plan by the School Planning Team, prior to endorsement to the Division Office for review and acceptance.	4.50	Very high level	4.47	Very high level

7. Preparing the Annual Implementation Plan.	4.30	Very high level	4.20	High level
8. Revisiting the Annual Implementation Plan (1st year) and identify programs and projects that have to be continued for the 2nd year & 3rd year.	3.50	High level	3.67	High level
9. Recording the facilitating factors in the 2nd year of AIP.	3.60	High level	3.73	High level
10. Checking the alignment of general objectives and targets of Annual Implementation Plan and the School Improvement Plan with the Division goals.	3.30	Moderate level	3.80	High level
Overall Mean	3.81	High level	3.96	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Table 44 revealed the LGU’s assessment on the Act phase relative to their age and sex and showed an overall mean rating of “moderate level”. The process of putting into actions about what had been decided and implemented as well demands thorough knowledge, skills and competence.

Younger LGUs has manifested a moderate level of assessment on item Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10. These has something to do with “Recording effective practices”, “Determining the accomplished and unaccomplished tasks”, “Comparing results, revisiting implementation process”, “Crafting training plan”, “Reviewing of the implementing structure and Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle”, which in essence deals with what and how the SIP is implemented to school. Being a neophyte at an early age, there is still a need for sufficient training on SIP. If this is not address by the school, it is likely that results which will be reflected will be the same. For the older LGUs, item Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 were rated as “moderate in level”. Considering that they are older, the possibility of low interests, negative attitudes, traditional beliefs, obsolete values can be a part of the reasons about the data reflected in Table 44. To some extent, it is not easy to do the job if we ourselves have not understood the program.

Male LGUs demonstrated “moderate level” in item Nos. 1, 2, 5 and 10 which states about “Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs”, “Recording effective practices”, “comparing”, “revisiting” and “crafting” and “planning schemes for effective implementation that demands time and work which in essence are “female” tasks. In addition, the existence of “social loafing” whenever there are group work holds true even in the SIP implementation. These facts holds true with the female LGU representatives.

Table 44: Level of Assessment in Crafting School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Age and Sex

Assess Phase	Age				Sex			
	Younger		Older		Male		Female	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	3.50	High level	3.00	Moderate level	3.31	Moderate level	3.17	Moderate level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of	3.33	Moderate level	3.31	Moderate level	3.38	Moderate level	3.25	Moderate level

preparation for your School Improvement Planning.								
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	3.33	Moderate level	3.31	Moderate level	3.46	High level	3.17	Moderate level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.00	High level	4.08	High level	4.00	High level	4.08	High level
5. Determining your school goals and objectives.	3.33	Moderate level	3.31	Moderate level	3.38	Moderate level	3.25	Moderate level
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	3.33	Moderate level	3.38	Moderate level	3.46	High level	3.25	Moderate level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	3.67	High level	3.69	High level	3.77	High level	3.58	High level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	3.33	Moderate level	3.38	Moderate level	3.77	High level	2.92	Moderate level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.25	Moderate level	3.38	Moderate level	3.54	High level	3.08	Moderate level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	3.33	Moderate level	3.15	Moderate level	3.38	Moderate level	3.08	Moderate level
Overall Mean	3.44	High level	3.40	Moderate level	3.55	Moderate level	3.28	Moderate level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational

Attainment and Position Title

Table 45 discussed the LGUs level of assessment on the Act phase relative to their highest educational attainment and position title revealed a “high level” rating for lower educational attainment and higher position title. Rating interpreted as “moderate level” were revealed in the overall mean for higher educational attainment and lower position title.

Rating stipulates “Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions” got three moderate ratings. LGU with Higher educational attainment has moderately assessed the item Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10. Considering the holistic viewpoint, it will reveal that these group still find difficulty in monitoring and evaluating the outcome of the SIP implementation not because they don’t have the necessary knowledge, skills and competence but likely there is some gaps with regards to the facilitating the implementation of the program in school. D. Morrison (2015) study revealed that improving the quality of education continues to be a central focus of many governments pursuing educational reforms. In such case the role of the Kagawad in-charge of the education sector. Similarly, this study revealed that because of the inadequacy of the knowledge, LGU representative tends to be passive in planning. Generally, LGUs and any other stakeholders come up to be exhausted with accomplishing the tasks. Yet one cannot say that it is the flaws of one or of the other. However, the data gathered and reflected in Table 45 provides us the information to the school that to augment the stakeholder’s participation, there is a need to reinforce such scheme with related activities that will persuade them to go back to school and assist in implementing, monitoring and evaluating SIP.

Table 45: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Act Phase and When Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment and Position Title

Assess Phase	Highest Educational Attainment				Position Title			
	Lower		Higher		Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Calling for school assembly and forming the School Planning Team	3.20	Moderate level	3.27	Moderate level	2.67	Moderate level	3.77	High level
2. Orienting your School Planning Team on the process of preparation for your School Improvement Planning.	3.80	High level	3.00	Moderate level	2.92	Moderate level	3.69	High level
3. Collecting, organizing and analyzing your school data.	3.80	High level	3.00	Moderate level	2.83	Moderate level	3.77	High level
4. Identifying core values and formulating the vision and mission of your school.	4.20		3.93	High level	4.08	High level	4.00	High level
5. Determining your school goals	3.70	High level	3.07	Moderate level	2.92	Moderate level	3.69	High level

and objectives.								
6. Identifying and Reviewing Priority Improvement Areas	3.60	High level	3.20	Moderate level	2.92	Moderate level	3.77	High level
7. Analyzing the Priority Improvement Areas and formulate general objectives.	3.80	High level	3.60	High level	3.25	Moderate level	4.08	High level
8. Organizing your teams for Implementation.	3.70	High level	3.13	Moderate level	3.08	Moderate level	3.62	High level
9. Validating the data gathered and soliciting views/concerns through interviews with the learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.60	High level	3.13	Moderate level	2.92	Moderate level	3.69	High level
10. Analyzing the school processes, identifying the critical conditions or the root cause for each area of focus relevant to the attainment of Priority Improvement Areas.	3.70	High level	2.93	Moderate level	3.00	Moderate level	3.46	High level
Overall Mean	3.71	High level	3.23	Moderate level	3.06	Moderate level	3.75	High level

Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Act Phase When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

The data obtained from Table 46 reflected the level of assessment of LGUs on the Act phase according to their family monthly income and disclosed the rating of “Moderate” for the low income and “high level” for those with higher income.

“Moderate” rating was given by the low monthly income receiver who are also an LGU representative. Nine out of 10 indicators have the same rating distributed leadership and task delegation are very substantial elements to school performance. The aspects of sharing, collaboration and participative work brings an assurance for the effectiveness and efficiency of the SIP. In the case of the LGUs with low income, there can be some factors owing to their “moderate Level” assessment such as: incompetence, low commitment, lack interests, time constraints, insufficient knowledge and personal matters/family problems may sip in as the reliable reasons for giving a passive importance to the SIP.

On the other hand, those receiving high income gave the rating of “high level”. Considering that in some situations, stakeholder’s participation tend to increase because they willingly share their financial resources to better serve the children. Thus, the results.

Table 46: Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives in the Act Phase When Grouped According to Average Family Monthly Income

Act Phase	Average Family Monthly Income			
	Lower		Higher	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
1. Testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions	2.50	Low level	3.73	High level
2. Recording effective practices which are found to have contributed to the attainment of targets for three (3) years.	3.10	Moderate level	3.47	High level
3. Determining which targets were attained and not attained.	3.00	Moderate level	3.53	High level
4. Exercising the core values, vision, and mission.	3.90	High level	4.13	High level
5. Comparing results before and after testing the solution.	3.00	Moderate level	3.53	High level
6. Revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done.	2.90	Moderate level	3.67	High level
7. Communicating successful solution to concerned stakeholders for feedback and support.	3.40	Moderate level	3.87	High level
8. Crafting training plan and other interventions to roll out solutions.	3.20	Moderate level	3.47	High level
9. Reviewing of the implementing structure including its composition; introduce revision if necessary.	3.00	Moderate level	3.53	High level
10. Planning for the preparation of SIP for the next cycle.	3.00	Moderate level	3.40	Moderate level
Overall Mean	3.10	Moderate level	3.63	High level

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads
When Grouped and Compared According to Variables

Table 47 presents the data on significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the school heads when grouped and compared according to variables. For Assess phase, the computed *p*-values on variables age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.720, 0.802, 0.354, 0.270 and 0.321 respectively. All the *p*-values were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the school heads in the Assess phase when grouped and compared according to variables is “accepted”.

This implies that the level of assessment of the school heads in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Assess Phase do not differs when they are grouped according to age, sex, highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income. Whether the School Heads was young old, male or female, lower or higher educational attainment, lower or higher position or having lower or higher income did not influence to their level of assessment of SIP.

For Plan phase, the computed p -values on variables age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.618, 0.167, 0.308, 0.555 and 0.968 respectively. All the p -values were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the school heads in the Plan phase when grouped and compared according to variables is “accepted”.

This implies that the school heads’ level of assessment in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Plan phase do not vary when they are grouped according to age, sex, highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income.

Further, on Act phase, the computed p -values on variables age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.923, 0.586, 0.560, 0.708 and 0.666 respectively. All the p -values were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the school heads in the Act phase when grouped and compared according to variables is “accepted”.

This implies that the level of assessment of the school heads in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Act Phase do not differs when they are grouped according to age, sex, highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income.

Table 47 Difference in the Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the School Heads When Grouped and Compared According to Variables

Assess Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	p -value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	33	37.45	612.0	720.0	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	39	35.69				
Sex	Male	32	37.19	618.0	0.802		Not Significant
	Female	40	35.95				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	40.29	431.5	0.354		Not Significant
	Higher	53	34.15				
Position Title	Lower	39	38.99	546.5	0.270		Not Significant
	Higher	33	33.56				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	40	38.68	553.0	0.321	Not Significant	
	Higher	32	33.78				
Plan Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	p -value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	33	35.17	599.5	0.618	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	39	37.63				
Sex	Male	32	32.70	518.5	0.167		Not Significant
	Female	40	39.54				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	40.68	424.0	0.308		Not Significant
	Higher	53	35.00				

Position Title	Lower	39	35.17	591.5	0.555		Not Significant
	Higher	33	38.08				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	40	36.41	636.5	0.968		Not Significant
	Higher	32	36.61				
Act Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	<i>p</i> -value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	33	36.24	635.0	0.923		Not Significant
	Older	39	36.72				
Sex	Male	32	38.00	592.0	0.586		Not Significant
	Female	40	35.20				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	19	38.89	458.0	0.560	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	53	35.64				
Position Title	Lower	39	35.65	610.5	0.708		Not Significant
	Higher	33	37.50				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	40	35.55	602.0	0.666		Not Significant
	Higher	32	37.69				

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers When Grouped and Compared According to Variables

Table 48 reveals the results on the significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the teachers when grouped and compared according to variables.

For Assess phase, the computed *p*-values on variables age, highest educational attainment, and average family monthly income were 0.179, 0.268, and 0.075 while for variable position title was 0.037. The computed *p*-values for age, highest educational attainment, and average family monthly income were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. On the other hand, the computed *p*-value for variable position title was less than 0.05 level of significant, thus, interpreted as “significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the teachers in the Assess phase when grouped and compared according to variables age, highest educational attainment, and average family monthly income were “accepted”, while for variable position title hypothesis was “rejected”.

This implies that the level of assessment of the teachers in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Assess Phase do not differs when they are grouped according to age, highest educational attainment and average family monthly income. On the other hand, when the teachers are grouped according to their position title their level of assessment differs.

For Plan phase, the computed *p*-values on variables highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.031, 0.045, and 0.009 while for variable age was 0.057. The computed *p*-values for variables highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were less than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “significant”. For variable age the computed *p*-value was greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the teachers in the Plan phase when grouped and compared according to variables highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were “rejected”, while for variable age hypothesis was “accepted”.

This implies that the teachers' level of assessment in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Plan phase varies when they are grouped according to highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income, while when the teachers are grouped according to age varies.

Further, on Act phase, the computed *p*-values on variables highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.414, 0.098, and 0.340, while for variable age was 0.011. The computed *p*-values for highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as "not significant". On the other hand, the computed *p*-value for variable age was less than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as "significant".

Therefore the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the teachers in the Act phase when grouped and compared according to variables highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were "accepted", while when teachers are grouped according to variable age hypothesis was "rejected".

This implies that the level of assessment of the teachers in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Act Phase do not differs when they are grouped according to highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income while when grouped according to age differs.

Table 48: Difference in the Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Teachers When Grouped and Compared According to Variables

Assess Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	<i>p</i> -value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	33.19	529.0	0.179	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	36	39.81				
Sex	Male						
	Female						
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	32	33.45	542.0	0.268		Not Significant
	Higher	40	38.94				
Position Title	Lower	46	32.64	420.5	0.037		Significant
	Higher	26	43.33				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	36	40.89	490.0	0.075	Not Significant	
	Higher	36	32.11				
Plan Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	<i>p</i> -value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	31.82	479.5	0.057	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	36	41.18				
Sex	Male						
	Female						
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	32	30.58	450.5	0.031		Significant
	Higher	40	41.24				
Position Title	Lower	46	32.78	427.0	0.045		Significant
	Higher	26	43.08				
Average Family	Lower	36	42.90	417.5	0.009	Significant	

Monthly Income	Higher	36	31.10				
Act Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	<i>p</i> -value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	30.22	422.0	0.011	0.05	Significant
	Older	36	42.78				
Sex	Male						
	Female						
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	32	34.25	568.0	0.414		Not Significant
	Higher	40	38.30				
Position Title	Lower	46	33.43	457.0	0.098		Not Significant
	Higher	26	41.92				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	36	38.85	563.5	0.340	Not Significant	
	Higher	36	34.15				

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents When Grouped and Compared According to Variables

Table 49 shows the data on the significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the parents when grouped and compared according to variables.

For Assess phase, the computed *p*-values on variables age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.131, 0.603, 0.662, 0.456 and 0.744 respectively. All the *p*-values were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the parents in the Assess phase when grouped and compared according to variables is “accepted”.

This implies that the level of assessment of the parents in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Assess Phase do not differs when they are grouped according to age, sex, highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income.

For Plan phase, the computed *p*-values on variables age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.152, 0.778, 0.756, 0.264 and 0.875 respectively. All the *p*-values were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the parents in the Plan phase when grouped and compared according to variables is “accepted”.

This implies that the parents’ level of assessment in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Plan phase do not vary when they are grouped according to age, sex, highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income.

Further, on Act phase, the computed *p*-values on variables age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.535, 0.741 0.451, 0.857 and 0.981 respectively. All the *p*-values were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the parents in the Act phase when grouped and compared according to variables is “accepted”.

This implies that the level of assessment of the parents in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Act Phase do not differs when they are grouped according to age, sex, highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income.

Table 49: Difference in the Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the Parents When Grouped and Compared According to Variables

Assess Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	p-value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	32.78	514.0	0.131	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	36	40.22				Not Significant
Sex	Male	22	34.57	507.5	0.603		Not Significant
	Female	50	37.35				Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	29	35.19	587.5	0.662		Not Significant
	Higher	43	37.38				Not Significant
Position Title	Lower	45	35.08	543.5	0.456		Not Significant
	Higher	27	38.87				Not Significant
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	49	35.95	536.5	0.744	Not Significant	
	Higher	23	37.67			Not Significant	
Plan Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	p-value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	32.97	521.0	0.152	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	36	40.03				Not Significant
Sex	Male	22	35.45	527.0	0.778		Not Significant
	Female	50	36.96				Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	29	35.57	596.5	0.756		Not Significant
	Higher	43	37.13				Not Significant
Position Title	Lower	45	34.37	511.5	0.264		Not Significant
	Higher	27	40.06				Not Significant
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	49	36.23	550.5	0.875	Not Significant	
	Higher	23	37.07			Not Significant	
Act Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	p-value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	36	34.97	593.0	0.535	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	36	38.03				Not Significant
Sex	Male	22	35.27	523.0	0.741		Not Significant
	Female	50	37.04				Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	29	34.24	558.0	0.451		Not Significant
	Higher	43	38.02				Not Significant
Position Title	Lower	45	36.16	592.0	0.857		Not

	Higher	27	37.07				Significant
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	49	36.46	561.5	0.981		Not Significant
	Higher	23	36.59				

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU

Representatives When Grouped and Compared

According to Variables

Table 50 reveals the data on the significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the LGU representatives when grouped and compared according to variables.

For Assess phase, the computed *p*-values on variables age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.956, 0.225, 0.633, 0.093 and 0.910 respectively. All the *p*-values were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the LGU representatives in the Assess phase when grouped and compared according to variables is “accepted”.

This implies that the level of assessment of the LGU representatives in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Assess Phase are somewhat the same when they are grouped according to age, sex, highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income.

For Plan phase, the computed *p*-values on variables age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.495, 0.604, 0.156, 0.275 and 0.845 respectively. All the *p*-values were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the LGU representatives in the Plan phase when grouped and compared according to variables is “accepted”.

This implies that the LGU representatives’ assessment in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Plan phase are somewhat of the same level when they are grouped according to age, sex, highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income.

Further, on Act phase, the computed *p*-values on variables age, sex, highest educational attainment, position title and average family monthly income were 0.935, 0.445, 0.420, 0.076 and 0.107 respectively. All the *p*-values were greater than 0.05 level of significance, thus, interpreted as “not significant”. Therefore the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the level of assessment in crafting the School Improvement Plan as assessed by the LGU representatives in the Act phase when grouped and compared according to variables is “accepted”.

This implies that the level of assessment of the LGU representatives in the crafting of School Improvement Plan in the Act Phase do not vary when they are grouped according to age, sex, highest educational attainment position title and average family monthly income.

Table 50: Difference in the Level of Assessment in Crafting the School Improvement Plan as Assessed by the LGU Representatives

When Grouped and Compared According to Variables

Assess Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	<i>p</i> -value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	12	12.92	77.0	0.956	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	13	13.08				
Sex	Male	13	14.96	56.0	0.225		Not

	Female	12	11.17				Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	10	13.85	66.5	0.633	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	15	12.43				Not Significant
Position Title	Lower	12	10.46	47.5	0.093		Not Significant
	Higher	13	15.35				Not Significant
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	10	18.20	73.0	0.910	Not Significant	
	Higher	15	13.13			Not Significant	
Plan Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	p-value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	12	11.96	65.5	0.495	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	13	13.96				Not Significant
Sex	Male	13	13.73	68.5	0.604		Not Significant
	Female	12	12.21				Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	10	15.55	49.5	0.156	Not Significant	
	Higher	15	11.30			Not Significant	
Position Title	Lower	12	11.33	58.0	0.275	Not Significant	
	Higher	13	14.54			Not Significant	
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	10	12.65	71.5	0.845	Not Significant	
	Higher	15	13.23			Not Significant	
Act Phase							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U test	p-value	Sig Level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	12	13.12	76.5	0.935	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	13	12.88				Not Significant
Sex	Male	13	14.08	64.0	0.445		Not Significant
	Female	12	11.83				Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	10	14.45	60.5	0.420	Not Significant	
	Higher	15	12.03			Not Significant	
Position Title	Lower	12	10.29	45.5	0.076	Not Significant	
	Higher	13	15.50			Not Significant	
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	10	10.10	46.0	0.107	Not Significant	
	Higher	15	14.93			Not Significant	

Desirable Attitudes of the School Heads that Help in the Crafting of School Improvement Plan

Table 51 presents the desirable attitudes of the schools that help in the crafting of School Improvement Plan. Of the 72 respondents, 66 of them choose items number 11 and 13 as rank No. 1.5 which states that “Willingly does his/her share of responsibility” and “Examines the root cause of problems and suggests effective solutions. Fosters new ideas, processes, and suggests better ways to do things (cost and/or operational efficiency)”. This implies the openness of School heads in the Division of Sagay City towards a more transparent and accountable leaders, data-driven, and evidenced-based decisions makers.

On the other hand, rank 16th, the last rank was in the item number 9 which states that “delivers error-free outputs most of the time by conforming to standard operating procedures correctly and consistently. Able to produce very satisfactory quality of work in terms of usefulness/acceptability and completeness with no supervision required.” 34 respondents out of the 72 answered these item. Openness to innovations and ideas as well as being positive in outlook. Confirming the observations that the scope, and the volume of tasks involves in the crafting, affects the desire to submit quality, error-free, responsive programs and projects, and submitted before the deadline SIP output.

Table 48: Desirable Attitudes of the School Head in Crafting the School Improvement Plan

Item No.	Attitudes	Frequency (N=72)	Rank
1	Displays emotional maturity and enthusiasm for and is challenged by higher goals.	64	3.5
2	Prioritize work tasks and schedules (through Gantt charts, checklists, etc.) to achieve goals.	56	9
3	Sets high quality, challenging, realistic goals for self and others	49	12.5
4	Practices ethical and professional behavior and conduct taking into account the impact of his/her actions and decisions.	61	5.5
5	Maintains professional image: being trustworthy, regularity of attendance and punctuality, and communication.	64	3.5
6	Makes personal sacrifices to meet the organization's needs.	61	5.5
7	Acts with a sense of urgency and responsibility to meet the organization's needs, improves systems and help others improve their effectiveness.	59	7
8	Avoids rework, mistakes and wastage through effective work methods by placing organizational needs before personal needs.	47	15
9	Delivers error-free outputs most of the time by conforming to standard operating procedures correctly and consistently. Able to produce very satisfactory quality of work in terms of usefulness/acceptability and completeness with no supervision required.	34	16
10	Expresses a desire to do better and may express frustration at waste or inefficiency. May focus on new or more precise ways of meeting goals set.	58	8
11	Willingly does his/her share of responsibility.	66	1.5
12	Can explain and articulate organizational directions, issues and problems.	55	11
13	Examines the root cause of problems and suggests effective solutions. Fosters new ideas, processes, and suggests better ways to do things (cost and/or operational efficiency).	66	1.5
14	Demonstrates an ability to think "beyond the box". Continuously focuses on improving personal productivity to create higher value and results.	55	11

15	Translates creative thinking into tangible changes and solutions that improve the work unit and organization.	55	11
16	Uses ingenious methods to accomplish responsibilities. Demonstrates resourcefulness and the ability to succeed with minimal resources.	49	12.5

Problems Encountered by the School Heads in Crafting their School Improvement Plan

Table 52 shows the problems encountered by the school heads in crafting their School Improvement Plan. Results shows that there were 58 respondents out of the 72 who answers item No. 2 as rank 1st which states that “ Teachers have regular loads and thus could not fully participate in the SIP writing”. Rank 2nd, is item No. 3 which states that “Principals have a lot of other tasks to do and have very little time left for SIP writing”. Correspondingly, rank 3rd is item No. 1 which states that “Very limited time is given to schools for crafting “. The results implies that teachers plays an important role in the crafting of SIP from the data gathering to data encoding if the School Head is not computer literate. Their active participation is needed to arrive at certain level of compliance, however, their main task of teaching is neglected due to constant meeting and planning for the crafting of SIP. Furthermore, the issues on workloads and time element are prominent in their responses. In addition, much as they don’t have sufficient knowledge on the SIP, there are very few or to some no available group of people in the community that could reinforce their insufficient knowledge, thus, SIP crafting could not be considered as comprehensive. This is considered to be the most crucial aspects in SIP crafting.

Meanwhile, difficulty in English proficiency asserts itself as one of the barriers in the crafting process. Thus, the need to make the right choice in the selection of the Planning Team must be diverse. Reading further through the FGD, issues such as: newly promoted school heads not able to attend the SIP training, parents and LGU representatives cannot participate in the discussions due to inadequate knowledge on the process, simply they were not trained and the only avenue for them to know the SIP is during the school assembly with several agenda being discussed. Compounding those were the supportive LGU representatives who volunteer to affix their signatures to the output, however, attendance to meeting called was not regular, others were just substitute and no connection to the process. Deviations to the template given were also noted. Request for technical assistance were highly suggested and one school head observed that “piece meal attitude” makes submission impossible during due date. Majority of the school heads noted that sudden call up for attendance to seminars, trainings, participation to various ancillary activities, hinders the completion. Also, some school heads needs further training on Project Work Plan Budget matrix preparation, data appreciation and validation.

Table 52 : Problems Encountered by the School Heads in Crafting their School Improvement Plan

Item No.	Attitudes	Frequency (N=72)	Rank
1	Time element – very limited is given to schools for crafting	45	3
2	Teachers have regular loads and thus could not fully participate in the SIP writing	58	1
3	Principals have a lot of other tasks to do and have very little time left for SIP writing	48	2
4	The size of the school matters in the SIP crafting, bigger schools means more PPA’s	31	5
5	Some schools do not have a team of community people to give technical input to SIP	39	4
6	Some schools do not have electricity adding a	13	9

	burden to SIP writing		
7	Many school heads are yet to be trained in computing and encoding	30	6.5
8	Input during SIP trainings are not readily picked up as school heads head back to their stations.	26	8
9	Proficiency in the English language may also be a barrier in SIP writing	30	6.5

Opportunities/Prospects Met by the School Heads in the Assess, Plan, and Act Phases of the School Improvement Plan

Table 53 shows the opportunities/prospects met by the school heads in the Assess, Plan, and Act phases of the School Improvement Plan. Item No. 4 which states “provides opportunities for school heads to become goal-oriented” rank 1st having a frequency of 69 out of 72 respondents. While item No. 7 which states “directly benefits the school and internal and external stakeholders” was rank 7th, the last rank. This implies school heads were not able to realize yet the importance of SIP in the daily operations of the school but rather on a more personal level of becoming goal-oriented, as supported by having rank 7th, the item No. 7 “directly benefits the school and internal and external stakeholders”. Empowered to decide and become goal oriented. Gives them opportunity to transform schools into what they decide to become and to bench mark best practices from among the schools in the division. Some define SIP as the guide or road, they thought that “the clearer the roadmap, the easier the achievement”. They felt a sense of ownership throughout the process. Appreciation of planning process and more room for innovation.

Table 53: Opportunities/Prospects Met by the School Heads in the Assess, Plan and Act Phases of the School Improvement Plan

Item No.	Attitudes	Frequency (N=72)	Rank
1	Planning properly a school’s Program, Project and Activity (PPA) can ease up future endeavors	68	2.5
2	SIP legitimizes requests for projects	68	2.5
3	It provides a good exercise in planning activities	66	5.5
4	Provides opportunities for school heads to become goal-oriented	69	1
5	Strengthens the school-community partnerships	67	4
6	Gives every stakeholder a chance to take part in the school improvement process	66	5.5
7	Directly benefits the school and internal and external stakeholders	62	7

School Improvement Plan as Part of Life of a School Head

Results of the study shows that 72 school heads answered “Yes” to the question that considered School Improvement Plan as part of the school heads’ life. This implies the acceptance of the school head to the empowerment afforded to them through RA 9155. Specifically, School Improvement Plan is a roadmap that lays specific interventions that a school, with the help of the community and other stakeholders, will undertake within a certain period. Implementation and development activities integral to it are prioritized and continually assess, analyze, and act for the improvement of service delivery, that both focus on the stakeholders’ needs and school’s desired performance (DepEd Order 44, 2015).

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of the study, the following conclusions were arrived at:

Considering the fact that the level of assessment of the school heads in the Assess, Plan and Act phases was very high, it can be concluded that school heads consider the crafting of the School Improvement Plan as part of their organic function thus have internalized and embraced this task already. The level of assessment of the teachers in the phases of Assess, Plan and Act was high, it can be concluded that teachers are the right arm of the school head and are accountable for the performance of the school hence they should have to enhance their competence in the crafting of the School Improvement Plan. The level of assessment in the phase of Assess, Plan, and Act of the parents being moderate level may mean that they need to be more participative in the achievement of the school. The level of assessment in the phases of Assess, Plan and Act of the LGU representative was high. Just like the teachers, the Local Government Units representatives assume the responsibility and accountability in the attainment of the vision, goals and objectives of the schools. Since the level of assessment of the school heads on the Assess phase when grouped according to the aforementioned variables was very high, on the Plan phase, assessment was very high, on the Act phase, assessment was high level, it can be concluded that the implementation of the plan and act phases as shown by rating of some items crucial to the delivery of solutions to root problems needs improvement. The level of assessment on the Assess, Plan and Act phases by the teachers when grouped according to the aforementioned variables was high. This can be concluded that teachers have already the grasp of the crafting of the School Improvement Plan, however, going deeper into the ratings per item there are lots to be done specially on the technical skills of teachers in assisting the school heads considering that limited trainings on the crafting of School Improvement Plan were conducted to the teachers group.

Level of assessment of the parents on the Assess phase when grouped according to the aforementioned variables was high, on the Plan phase was moderate, and on the Act phase was also moderate. This can be concluded that parents in assisting the school heads in the crafting of School Improvement Plan needs extensive trainings on how crafting is done. The level of assessment of the LGU representatives on the Assess and Plan phases when grouped according to the aforementioned variables was high and on the Act phase was moderate. This implies that proper orientation, training, and dissemination of the School Improvement Plan must be given emphasis so as to improve the assistance that they can give to the school heads during the crafting of School Improvement Plan, likewise, improve the implementation phase of the School Improvement Plan. High consideration on those conclusions were based from the discouraging ratings per item on assessment. There is no significant difference in the level of assessment of School Improvement Plan in the Assess, Plan and Act Phases as assessed by the school heads, parents, and LGU representatives. However, as assessed by the teachers group no significant difference exists in the Assess phase but significant difference exists in the Plan phase. One variable position title, recorded a significant difference and in the Act phase on variable age, recorded a significant difference. This can be concluded that in order for the teachers group to have quality assistance in the crafting of School Improvement Plan, issues such as orientation of the School Planning Team, brainstorming and formulating solutions based on the root cause by the Project Teams, technical knowledge on developing Project. Work Plan and Budget Matrix by the Project Teams, conducting project monitoring during the middle and end of implementation period by the School Planning Team, testing and reviewing the proposed project designs as solutions and revisiting implementation process if solution is not effective to see where improvements should be done must be addressed by the school heads. Reading deeper the results of the assessments of those issues mentioned and comparing to the top three problems encountered by the school heads in the crafting of the School Improvement Plan helps this researcher to conclude that the phases were not properly implemented as expected.

Desirable attitudes of majority of the school Heads in the Division of Sagay City are willingness to share responsibility, examines the root cause of the problems, suggests effective solutions, foster new ideas, processes and suggests better ways to do things (cost and/or operational efficiency). Teachers not fully participating in the School Improvement Plan writing, principals have a lot of tasks and little time left for School Improvement Plan writing, and limited time given to schools to craft the School Improvement Plan are the top three problems in crafting the School Improvement Plan.

In the Assess, Plan and Act phases, school heads were provided opportunities to become goal-oriented, plan properly school's program, project and activity, and legitimizes requests for project fund from the school's monthly operating expenses.

School Improvement Plan is part of school head's life.

References

1. Anchilo, L. M. (2015). Supervisory Management Guidelines in the Implementation of School Improvement Plan. Ang Pantas. Research Journal of the School of Education. Arellano University. Manila, Philippines.
2. Aquino, Gaudencio (2012). Fundamentals of Research. National Book Store. Manila, Philippines
3. Ashagre, Rahel (2014). The Implementation of School Improvement Program in Kokebe. A Master's Thesis. Addis Ababa University. Ethiopia.
4. Best, Joel (2013). Stat-Spotting: A field Guide to Identifying Dubious Data. First Edition. University of California Press.
5. Bluman, Allan (2014). Elementary Statistics: A Step-by-step Approach. 9th Edition. McGraw-Hill Education. USA
6. Briones, Leonor (2016). Declaration of Vision and Agenda (Quality, Accessible, Relevant and Liberating Basic Education for All. Department of Education.
7. Bottoms, G. and Davis, J.S. (2010). The Three Essentials: Improving Schools Requires Vision, District and State Support and Principal Leadership. Southern Regional Education Board.
8. Cabardo, Jimmy Rey (2016). Levels of Participation of the School Stakeholders to the Different School-Initiated Activities and the Implementation of School Based-Management. Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education. Vol. 8.
9. Calderon, Jose (2012). Measurement and Evaluation. National Book Store. Manila, Philippines.
10. Creswell, John (2012). Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research. 4th Edition. Pearson Publication. Boston.
11. CSC Memo Circular #06, s. 2012. Guidelines in the Establishment and Implementation of the Strategic Performance in all Government Agencies
12. DepEd Order #44 s. 2015. School Improvement Plan Guidebook.
13. DepEd Order #2, s. 2015. Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education.
14. DepEd Order #52, s. 2016. Data Dictionary, Office of the Planning Service, Department of Education
15. Department of Education Manual (2011).
16. Deluca, C. and Johnson, S. (2017). Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice.
17. Duerden, M. and Witt, P. (2012). Assessing Program Implementation: What it is, Why It's Important and How to Do it. Journal of Extension. Vol. 50. The Research Gate. Texas
18. Escobar, I. H. G. (2016). School improvement plans, a tool to improve the quality of education. New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences. 6(1), pp 440–450. Available from: www.prosoc.eu
19. Ettinger, Robert (2015). Shifting from Plan to a Process: School Improvement Plans in the Cambridge Public Schools. A Doctoral Dissertation. Harvard Graduate School Education.
20. Hanover Research (2014). Best Practices for School Improvement Planning. 1700 K Street, NW, Washington, DC
21. Hofosha, Dereje (2012). The Implementation and challenges of School Improvement Program in Government Secondary Schools of Oroma Special Zone. A Master's Thesis. Addis Ababa University. Ethiopia.
22. Houser, Rick (2015). Counselling and Educational Research Evaluation and Application. 3rd Edition. London.
23. Keaikitse, Sethomo (2012). Classroom Assessment Practices. University of Botswana.

24. Khatrri, N., Ling, C. and Yha, S. (2010). The Effects of School Based Management in the Philippines: An Initial Assessment Using Administrative Data. *Journal on Development Effectiveness*. Vol. 4
25. Konok, Islam (2012). Sustainable School Improvement: A Case Study of the Needs of Two Bangladeshi School. A Dissertation. University of Saskatchewan. Saskaton. Bangladesh
26. Mitchell, Rafael (2014). The Implication of School Improvement and School Effectiveness Research for Primary School Principals in Ethopia. *Journal on Educational Review*. Vol. 67
27. Morrison, Daryl (2015). School Improvement Planning: A Failed Hope
28. Napoleone, Antonio (2012). School Improvement Planning and Student Achievement: A Case Study for Best Practices in Schools and District. A Dissertation. Southern Connecticut State University.
29. Niepes, Carolina (2016). Technical Assistance: Its New Paradigm. Department of Education.
30. Nori, John (2012). School Improvement: The Simple Truth: School Culture is the Foundation of School Improvement. Retrieved form <http://ezproxy.hamline.edu>
31. Oo, Mya (2016). Action Research for Continuous Improvement. 5th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies. Spain
32. Parham, Alfred (2015). Data Driven Decision Making for School Improvement Planning: Toward a Model and Process for Distributive Leadership and Shared Decision Making. A Dissertation. Auburn University. Alabama
33. RA 9155 Education Act of 2001. An Act Instituting a Framework of Governance for Basic Education, Establishing Authority and Accountability.
34. Robbins, S. and Coulter, M. (2013). *Fundamentals of Management*. 11th Edition. Prentice Hall Publishing.
35. Silverman, David (2011). *Doing Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publication. Sydney, Australia.
36. Sinay, E. and Ryan, T. G. (2016). Research series on school effectiveness and school improvement: Characteristics of effective school improvement planning and key steps. (Research Report No. 16/17-04). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Toronto District School Board
37. Schermerhorn, John Jr. (2013). *Introduction to Management*. 12th Edition. Hoboken, New Jersey.
38. Soundaian, S. (2011). *Principles of Management*. MJP Publishers. New Delhi, India
39. Torres, Alvarado (2016). Can Education Technical Assistance be a Strategy for Teacher Professional Development. Reflection for a Chilean Case Study.
40. Whitehouse, Mary (2015). *The Importance of Assessment in Curriculum Planning*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.