

Challenges, Responsibilities and Strategies of School Leaders on the Resource Mobilization and School Operation in Managing SBM

Michelle Repollo Occidental

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: julierosemendoza002@gmail.com

Abstract—This study examined the leadership factors of school heads and their influence on School-Based Management (SBM) performance. Specifically, it aimed to determine the levels of school heads' challenges, responsibilities, and strategies; assess the level of Managing SBM in resource mobilization and school operations; and examine the significant relationships among these variables. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed to describe variables and determine relationships among them. The respondents were 113 public elementary school heads from the 13 sub-offices in the 4th Congressional District under the Schools Division Office of Laguna, selected through random sampling. A researcher-made survey questionnaire was used to gather data. Statistical tools such as mean and standard deviation were utilized to determine variable levels, while Pearson's r correlation was used to examine the relationship. Findings revealed that school heads demonstrated extremely high levels in managing challenges and fulfilling responsibilities. However, implementing leadership strategies was rated very high. Resource mobilization and school operation in managing was rated extremely high. Results showed significant positive relationships between leadership factors, resource mobilization, and school operation in managing SBM. It was concluded that effective leadership strengthens SBM implementation. Thus, school heads are encouraged to continuously enhance leadership practices to improve school performance and ensure sustainability. A significant relationship was found between school heads' challenges, responsibilities, and strategies, and resource mobilization and school operations in managing School-Based Management (SBM). The findings highlight that effective leadership through proper time management, clear roles, strong instructional practices, stakeholder engagement, and adaptive strategies enhances the efficient use of resources and ensures smooth school operations. The study recommends that school leaders enhance time management, role clarity, and workload distribution; strengthen instructional leadership and stakeholder engagement; and sustain effective strategies such as capacity building, communication, and adaptive leadership. It also emphasizes improving resource mobilization through transparency, partnerships, and innovation, and continuous review of school operations. Future studies are encouraged to further explore factors influencing effective SBM implementation.

Keywords— School-Based Management (SBM), school leadership, school heads, challenges, responsibilities, leadership strategies, resource mobilization, school operation.

I. INTRODUCTION

School-Based Management (SBM) has become a key governance framework in education. It grants school heads autonomy over most school matters. SBM aims to improve

education by transferring significant decision-making authority and greater accountability to the school level (Tipuric, 2022).

Focusing on SBM, school leaders are expected to exercise autonomy and accountability in mobilizing resources and managing school operations. However, school leaders frequently encounter significant challenges in resource mobilization and school operations due to limited funding, varying levels of stakeholder support, and external pressures from policy mandates and community expectations. Within the framework of SBM, school leaders are tasked with prioritizing the needs of their schools and aligning resource utilization with the school's improvement plan (Yuki & Gardner, 2020). In addition, they are expected to develop innovative strategies to maximize limited resources, ensure transparency in financial management, and foster collaboration among stakeholders.

In connection with the above discussion, as schools face constraints such as limited funding, growing demands, and accountability requirements, school leaders are expected to be innovative, transparent, and proactive in balancing these two interconnected aspects- resource mobilization and school operations. In many cases, schools face resource constraints, including inadequate classrooms, insufficient instructional materials, and limited access to technology. In addition, schools commonly face operational challenges, such as inadequate facilities, curriculum gaps, weak stakeholder participation, and student-related problems (Sheninger, 2024). By balancing these two, school heads play an important role in the effective implementation of SBM, thereby contributing to improved school performance and educational outcomes. This study sought to analyze how school leaders manage these challenges and responsibilities, and the strategies they employ to uphold the principles of SBM in the context of resource mobilization and school operations.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

This study aims to examine how the challenges, responsibilities, and strategies of school heads influence resource mobilization and school operations in the effective management of School-Based Management (SBM), to sustain school development and improve overall school performance.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions;

1. What are the levels of challenges faced by the school leaders in terms of:
 - 1.1 Time management;
 - 1.2 Role Ambiguity; and
 - 1.3 Workload Distribution?
2. What is the level of responsibility of school leaders in terms of:
 - 2.1 Instructional Leadership;
 - 2.2 Stakeholder engagement; and
 - 2.3 Policy implementation?
3. What is the level of strategies of school leaders in terms of:
 - 3.1 Capacity building programs;
 - 3.2 Enhancing communication strategies; and
 - 3.3 Adaptive leadership approaches?
4. What is the level of resource mobilization in Managing SBM in terms of:
 - 4.1 Resource availability and utilization;
 - 4.2 Financial transparency and accountability; and
 - 4.3 Partnerships and network strength;
 - 4.4 Innovation and improvement projects?
5. What is the level of school operation in managing SBM in terms of:
 - 5.1 School planning and development;
 - 5.2 Personnel and human resource management;
 - 5.3 Monitoring and evaluation;
 - 5.4 Student services and support?
6. Do the challenges of school leaders have a significant relationship with the resource mobilization and school operation in managing SBM?
7. Do the responsibilities of school leaders have a significant relationship with the resource mobilization and school operation in managing SBM?
8. Do the strategies of school leaders have a significant relationship with the resource mobilization and school operation in managing SBM?

II. METHODOLOGY

A descriptive-correlational research design was employed to describe variables and determine relationships among them. The respondents were 113 public elementary school heads from the 13 sub-offices in the 4th Congressional District under the Schools Division Office of Laguna, selected through random sampling. A researcher-made survey questionnaire was used to gather data. Statistical tools such as mean and standard deviation were utilized to determine variable levels, while Pearson's *r* correlation was used to examine the relationship.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the results of the data gathered and discusses the findings derived from the statistical treatment applied in the study. All specific questions stated in Chapter I under the Statement of the Problem are addressed in this chapter and are supported by the corresponding tables. It presents data on the level of school leaders' challenges, responsibilities, strategies, resource mobilization, and school operations as a basis for understanding their professional

experiences and identifying possible areas for improvement in school management practices.

Level of School Leaders' Challenges

In this study, the level of school leaders' challenges refers to the extent to which they experience difficulties in terms of Time Management, Role Ambiguity, and Workload Distribution.

These dimensions describe how school leaders manage competing responsibilities within limited time frames, address unclear or overlapping roles and expectations, and allocate tasks and responsibilities within the organization. Understanding these challenges provides insight into the pressures and constraints that may affect decision-making, staff management, and overall school performance.

The following tables present the statements, means, standard deviations, remarks, and verbal interpretations based on participants' responses. These tables serve as a visual and analytical representation of the findings, highlighting areas where school leaders demonstrate strengths as well as areas that may require targeted interventions or professional development. Furthermore, the discussion of results links these findings to broader implications for effective School-Based Management (SBM) implementation and resource optimization within the school system.

Table 1. Level of School Leaders' Challenges in Terms of Time Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Allocate sufficient time for instructional supervision and classroom visits.	6.33	0.78	Strongly Agree
Balance administrative work with academic leadership duties.	6.18	0.79	Strongly Agree
Handle unexpected interruptions without compromising scheduled activities.	6.11	0.87	Agree
Delegate tasks appropriately to maximize time efficiency.	6.23	0.74	Strongly Agree
Organize meetings to minimize disruption to core responsibilities.	6.23	0.87	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.22		
SD	0.60		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.33 was recorded for "Allocate sufficient time for instructional supervision and classroom visits." This implies that dedicating adequate time to instructional leadership remains a pressing concern. It indicates that while school heads recognize the importance of classroom supervision, competing administrative duties may limit the time available for direct instructional support. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.11 was obtained for "Handle unexpected interruptions without compromising scheduled activities," interpreted as Agree. This indicates that unforeseen tasks and disruptions are common in school settings and signify the dynamic nature of school operations, where leaders must frequently adjust plans while maintaining productivity.

Overall, the findings indicate that time management significantly influences the effectiveness of leadership practices in managing SBM. The consistently high ratings signify that school heads operate in environments characterized by overlapping demands and limited time

resources. This implies that effective delegation, prioritization of core functions, and structured scheduling are critical in sustaining instructional quality and operational efficiency. Furthermore, the uniformity of responses indicates that time-related challenges are systemic rather than isolated, signifying the need for organizational structures that support school leaders in managing multiple responsibilities simultaneously.

Table 2 presents the level of school leaders' challenges related to role ambiguity. The overall weighted mean of 6.32, with a standard deviation of 0.57, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that school leaders experience significant role ambiguity in the performance of their duties. The low standard deviation indicates that respondents share consistent perceptions of unclear or overlapping responsibilities. This implies that school heads operate in environments where multiple expectations and responsibilities intersect, requiring them to continuously clarify and reconcile their roles within the School-Based Management framework.

Table 2. Level of School Leaders' Challenges in Terms of Role Ambiguity

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Distinguish overlapping functions between administrative and instructional duties.	6.56	0.61	Strongly Agree
Interpret vague directives from higher authorities effectively.	6.39	0.72	Strongly Agree
Balance conflicting roles required by school management and community demands.	6.22	0.82	Strongly Agree
Determine specific expectations from different stakeholders.	6.22	0.78	Strongly Agree
Address role conflicts that arise from multiple expectations.	6.22	0.85	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.32		
SD	0.57		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.56 was recorded for "Distinguish overlapping functions between administrative and instructional duties." This implies that managing the dual responsibilities of administration and instructional leadership remains a primary concern. It indicates that school leaders frequently navigate boundaries between managerial tasks and academic supervision, which may create complexity in decision-making and prioritization. The lowest mean of 6.22 was obtained for three statements: "Balance conflicting roles required by school management and community demands," "Determine specific expectations from different stakeholders," and "Address role conflicts that arise from multiple expectations." Even though these scores are a little bit lower, they still show that managing expectations and dealing with role disputes related to stakeholders are major problems, highlighting how diverse school leadership is.

Overall, the findings indicate that role ambiguity is a significant leadership challenge in managing SBM. The consistently high ratings across all indicators signify that school heads must constantly interpret directives, balance institutional and community expectations, and resolve overlapping functions. This implies that clarity of roles, defined responsibilities, and structured communication channels are essential in strengthening leadership effectiveness. The uniformity of responses further signifies that role ambiguity is not an isolated issue but a shared

experience among school leaders, influencing how they manage both instructional and operational responsibilities.

Table 3 presents the level of school leaders' challenges regarding workload distribution. The overall weighted mean of 6.47, with a standard deviation of 0.51, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that workload distribution is widely perceived as a significant leadership challenge. The low standard deviation indicates strong consistency in respondents' perceptions, suggesting that school leaders commonly encounter similar concerns when assigning and balancing responsibilities. This implies that managing human resources effectively is a critical component of school leadership, particularly within the decentralized structure of School-Based Management, where accountability and shared responsibilities are emphasized.

Table 3. Level of School Leaders' Challenges in Terms of Workload Distribution

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Distribute tasks fairly among teachers and staff members.	6.55	0.60	Strongly Agree
Assign duties according to staff skills and expertise.	6.51	0.61	Strongly Agree
Adjust task distribution when unexpected responsibilities arise.	6.42	0.73	Strongly Agree
Ensure equitable sharing of administrative and teaching duties.	6.40	0.78	Strongly Agree
Address complaints or concerns related to uneven task assignments.	6.48	0.62	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.47		
SD	0.51		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.55 was recorded for "Distribute tasks fairly among teachers and staff members." This implies that fairness in task allocation is a central issue in leadership practice and indicates that school heads are highly attentive to maintaining equity within their teams. A fair distribution of tasks helps preserve staff morale, prevent burnout, and sustain productivity. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.40 was obtained for "Ensure equitable sharing of administrative and teaching duties," although it remains interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that balancing instructional and administrative responsibilities across personnel is particularly complex, signifying the difficulty of aligning individual competencies, workload capacity, and institutional demands.

Overall, the findings indicate that workload distribution directly influences organizational efficiency and staff dynamics in SBM implementation. The consistently high ratings indicate that school leaders must continually evaluate staff strengths, monitor task assignments, and respond to concerns about imbalance or overload. This implies that effective workload management is closely linked to team cohesion, operational continuity, and the school's overall

performance. Furthermore, the uniformity of responses indicates that workload-related challenges are systemic, reflecting the broad scope of responsibilities placed on school leaders and their personnel within the SBM framework.

Table 4. Composite Level of School Leaders' Challenges

Indicators	Weighted Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Time management	6.22	0.60	Extremely High
Role Ambiguity	6.32	0.57	Extremely High
Workload Distribution	6.47	0.51	Extremely High
Grand Mean	6.34	0.56	Extremely High

Table 4 presents the composite level of school leaders' challenges regarding time management, role ambiguity, and workload distribution. The overall mean of 6.34, with a standard deviation of 0.56, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that school leaders experience significant leadership-related challenges. The relatively low standard deviation suggests consistent responses, indicating that these challenges are commonly encountered across the schools involved in the study. This implies that the demands associated with leadership roles under School-Based Management are both complex and multidimensional.

Among the indicators, Workload Distribution had the highest weighted mean of 6.47, indicating that assigning and balancing responsibilities among personnel is the most frequently experienced challenge. This indicates that ensuring fairness, equity, and proper alignment of tasks with staff competencies requires continuous managerial attention. In contrast, Time Management recorded the lowest weighted mean of 6.22, although still interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that while time management remains a substantial concern, it is slightly less pressing than workload distribution and role ambiguity. The close proximity of the means among the three indicators indicates that all aspects of leadership challenges are strongly interconnected.

Overall, the findings indicate that school leaders operate within demanding professional environments where multiple responsibilities must be addressed simultaneously. The consistently high ratings across all indicators indicate that effective leadership in SBM requires strong organizational skills, clear roles, and strategic task delegation. This implies that leadership challenges are not isolated to a single dimension but encompass time allocation, role clarity, and workload balance, all of which directly influence the efficiency of school operations and the sustainability of school development efforts.

Level of School Leaders' Responsibilities

In this study, the scope of school leaders' responsibilities is examined across instructional leadership, stakeholder engagement, and policy implementation. The findings determine the extent to which these responsibilities are carried out in managing School-Based Management (SBM) and indicate how leadership practices contribute to effective school governance, collaborative participation, and institutional accountability.

Table 5. Level of School Leaders' Responsibilities in Terms of Instructional Leadership

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Supervise classroom instruction to ensure effective teaching practices.	6.40	0.73	Strongly Agree
Align instructional practices with curriculum standards and learning outcomes.	6.30	0.77	Strongly Agree
Encourage innovation in lesson delivery and student engagement.	6.34	0.81	Strongly Agree
Evaluate teaching performance through regular observations and feedback.	6.36	0.80	Strongly Agree
Facilitate collaborative planning among teachers for curriculum improvement.	6.31	0.80	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.34		
SD	0.62		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 5 presents the level of school leaders' responsibilities in terms of instructional leadership. The overall weighted mean of 6.34, with a standard deviation of 0.62, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that school leaders perform instructional leadership responsibilities to a very great extent. The relatively low standard deviation suggests consistency in responses, indicating that school heads share similar perceptions of their active involvement in instructional supervision and academic improvement. This implies that instructional leadership remains a central component of school management under the School-Based Management framework.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.40 was recorded for "Supervise classroom instruction to ensure effective teaching practices." This implies that direct monitoring of classroom instruction is a primary responsibility of school leaders and indicates a strong commitment to maintaining teaching quality. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.30 was obtained for "Align instructional practices with curriculum standards and learning outcomes," although it remains interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that while curriculum alignment is consistently practiced, it may require continuous coordination and monitoring to ensure full consistency across subject areas and grade levels. The close range of mean scores signifies that all aspects of instructional leadership are actively carried out with comparable intensity.

In general, the data suggest that school leaders have a big impact on the academic course and instructional quality of their schools. The consistently high ratings signify that supervision, evaluation, innovation, and collaborative planning are integral to their leadership practices. This implies that strong instructional leadership directly contributes to curriculum coherence, teacher development, and improved student learning outcomes, thereby reinforcing the effectiveness of SBM implementation at the school level.

Table 6 presents the level of school leaders' responsibilities regarding stakeholder engagement. The overall weighted mean of 6.39, with a standard deviation of 0.62, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that school

leaders carry out stakeholder engagement responsibilities to a great extent. The relatively low standard deviation suggests consistent responses, indicating that school heads commonly recognize the importance of involving parents, community members, and external partners in school governance. This implies that collaborative leadership is firmly embedded in the management practices under School-Based Management.

Table 6. Level of School Leaders' Responsibilities in Terms of Stakeholder Engagement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Establish strong partnerships with parents, community members, and organizations.	6.40	0.74	Strongly Agree
Encourage active stakeholder participation in school programs and decision-making.	6.37	0.71	Strongly Agree
Involve stakeholders in the planning and implementation of school projects.	6.44	0.72	Strongly Agree
Promote transparency in school operations through stakeholder consultations.	6.41	0.77	Strongly Agree
Strengthen linkages with external agencies for additional resources and support.	6.34	0.77	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.39		
SD	0.62		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.44 was recorded for "Involve stakeholders in planning and implementation of school projects." This implies that participatory planning is a key leadership responsibility and indicates that school leaders actively integrate stakeholders into school development initiatives. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.34 was obtained for "Strengthen linkages with external agencies for additional resources and support," although it remains interpreted as Strongly Agree. This implies that while external agency collaboration is regularly sought, maintaining and expanding such ties may need sustained effort and coordination. The close proximity of the mean scores indicates that all dimensions of stakeholder engagement are given comparable emphasis.

Overall, the findings indicate that stakeholder engagement plays a vital role in strengthening school governance and operational effectiveness. The consistently high ratings signify that transparency, participation, and partnership-building are integral components of school leadership. This implies that active collaboration with internal and external stakeholders contributes to shared accountability, improved resource generation, and sustained school development within the SBM framework.

Table 7. Level of School Leaders' Responsibilities in Terms of Policy Implementation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Implement school policies in alignment with national and local education guidelines.	6.48	0.67	Strongly Agree
Ensure that teachers and staff comply with the school's established rules and policies.	6.32	0.79	Strongly Agree
Evaluate the effectiveness of implemented policies in improving school performance.	6.17	0.91	Strongly Agree
Enforce disciplinary measures in accordance with established school policies.	6.20	0.90	Strongly Agree
Adjust the policy application to fit the school's unique needs and context.	6.34	0.88	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.30		
SD	0.68		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 7 presents the extent of school leaders' responsibilities in policy implementation. The overall weighted mean of 6.30, with a standard deviation of 0.68, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that policy implementation responsibilities are largely carried out by school leaders. The moderate standard deviation suggests relative consistency in responses, indicating that school heads share similar perceptions of their roles in enforcing and evaluating school policies. This implies that adherence to institutional guidelines and regulatory frameworks is a central aspect of leadership practice within School-Based Management.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.48 was recorded for "Implement school policies in alignment with national and local education guidelines." This implies that compliance with established educational standards is a primary responsibility of school leaders and indicates strong alignment between school-level practices and governing authorities. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.17 was obtained for "Evaluate the effectiveness of implemented policies in improving school performance," although it remains interpreted as Strongly Agree. This shows that while policies are strictly implemented, more methodical thought may need to be given to continually evaluating their influence on school performance. The relatively narrow range of mean scores indicates that all aspects of policy implementation are consistently implemented.

Overall, the findings indicate that policy implementation is firmly embedded in school heads' leadership functions. The consistently high ratings signify that leaders not only enforce compliance but also adapt policies to fit the unique context of their schools. This implies that effective policy implementation contributes to organizational order, accountability, and alignment with educational goals, thereby supporting the overall effectiveness of SBM management.

Table 8 presents the composite level of school leaders' responsibilities across instructional leadership, stakeholder engagement, and policy implementation. The overall mean of 6.34, with a standard deviation of 0.64, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that school leaders perform their responsibilities to a very great extent. The relatively low standard deviation indicates consistency in respondents' perceptions, suggesting that these leadership responsibilities are uniformly practiced across the schools in the study. This implies that responsibility-driven leadership is a defining characteristic of school management under the SBM framework.

Table 8. Composite Level of School Leaders' Responsibilities

Indicators	Weighted Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Instructional Leadership	6.34	0.62	Extremely High
Stakeholder Engagement	6.39	0.62	Extremely High
Policy Implementation	6.30	0.68	Extremely High
Grand Mean	6.34	0.64	Extremely High

Among the indicators, Stakeholder Engagement had the highest weighted mean of 6.39, indicating that collaboration with parents, community members, and external partners is strongly emphasized in school leadership. This indicates that

participatory governance and shared accountability are actively practiced. In contrast, Policy Implementation recorded the lowest weighted mean of 6.30, although still interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that while policies are consistently enforced and aligned with educational standards, evaluating and contextualizing their application remains a continuing responsibility. The close range of the mean scores signifies that instructional, collaborative, and regulatory responsibilities are carried out with comparable intensity.

Overall, the findings indicate that school leaders demonstrate a comprehensive approach to their professional responsibilities. The consistently high ratings signify balanced attention to instructional supervision, stakeholder involvement, and policy enforcement. This implies that effective fulfillment of these responsibilities strengthens organizational coherence, enhances collaborative relationships, and sustains institutional accountability, all of which contribute to the successful implementation of School-Based Management.

Level of School Leaders' Strategies

In this study, the level of school leaders' strategies is examined in terms of capacity-building programs, enhanced communication, and adaptive leadership. The findings determine the extent to which these strategic practices are implemented in managing School-Based Management (SBM) and indicate how proactive planning, effective communication, and leadership adaptability contribute to organizational effectiveness and sustained school improvement.

Table 9 presents the level of school leaders' strategies regarding capacity-building programs. The overall weighted mean of 5.84, with a standard deviation of 0.74, is interpreted as Very High. This indicates that school leaders implement capacity-building strategies to a great extent. The moderate standard deviation signifies reasonable consistency in the responses, although slightly higher variation is observed compared to previous variables.

Table 9. Level of School Leaders' Strategies in Terms of Capacity Building Programs

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Organize professional development activities that address teachers' needs.	5.61	1.09	Agree
Provide training sessions that enhance both instructional and leadership skills.	6.00	0.89	Agree
Identify staff skill gaps to design relevant capacity-building programs.	5.79	0.93	Agree
Partner with external agencies and institutions to deliver training opportunities.	5.85	0.85	Agree
Allocate resources for continuous learning and staff development.	5.93	0.88	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.84		
SD	0.74		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

This implies that while professional development initiatives are actively practiced, the intensity of implementation may vary across schools.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.00 was recorded for "Provide training sessions that enhance both instructional and leadership skills." This implies that school leaders prioritize professional growth that strengthens both teaching competence and leadership capacity. It indicates recognition of continuous learning as essential for improving instructional quality and organizational performance. In contrast, the lowest mean of 5.61 was obtained for "Organize professional development activities that address teachers' needs," although it remains interpreted as Agree. This indicates that while development programs are conducted, aligning them precisely with teachers' specific needs may require further systematic assessment and planning. The relatively wider standard deviations across items signify differing levels of experience in designing and sustaining structured training programs.

Overall, the findings indicate that capacity building is an important strategic approach for managing SBM, though it is implemented at a slightly lower intensity than leadership responsibilities and challenges.

The consistently high ratings signify that school leaders recognize professional development as vital to sustaining school improvement. This implies that strengthening needs assessment mechanisms, expanding partnerships, and ensuring sustained resource allocation for training may further enhance staff competence and long-term organizational effectiveness.

Table 10 presents the level of school leaders' strategies for enhancing communication. The overall weighted mean of 5.63, with a standard deviation of 0.78, is interpreted as Very High. This indicates that school leaders practice communication-related strategies to a great extent.

The moderate standard deviation suggests some variability in responses, suggesting that the application of communication strategies may differ across schools. This implies that while communication is recognized as essential in leadership, its implementation may vary based on leadership style and institutional demands.

Table 10. Level of School Leaders' Strategies in Terms of Enhancing Communication Strategies

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Adjust the leadership style to meet the needs of teachers and staff.	5.56	1.09	Agree
Recognize changing educational demands and adapt strategies accordingly.	5.61	0.98	Agree
Maintain composure and decisiveness in times of crisis or uncertainty.	5.69	0.92	Agree
Build resilience within the school community to cope with change.	5.60	1.02	Agree
Modify existing plans to align with emerging needs and opportunities.	5.70	0.96	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.63		
SD	0.78		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 5.70 was recorded for "Modify existing plans to align with emerging needs and opportunities," closely followed by "Maintain composure and decisiveness in times of crisis or uncertainty" with a mean of 5.69. These findings imply that adaptability and stability during periods of change are central components

of school leadership. They indicate that school heads actively respond to evolving conditions while maintaining direction and order. In contrast, the lowest mean of 5.56 was obtained for “Adjust leadership style based on the needs of teachers and staff,” although it remains interpreted as Agree. This indicates that while leaders recognize the importance of flexibility in leadership approach, consistently tailoring leadership styles to individual needs may require continuous reflection and situational awareness.

Overall, the findings indicate that enhancing communication strategies is vital to sustaining school operations and managing change within the SBM framework. The consistently high ratings signify that school leaders demonstrate responsiveness, resilience, and adaptability in their leadership practices. This implies that effective communication and adaptive planning contribute to organizational stability, collaborative relationships, and the school’s capacity to respond to emerging challenges and opportunities.

Table 11. Level of School Leaders’ Strategies in Terms of Adaptive Leadership Approaches

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Establish clear channels of communication among teachers, staff, and stakeholders.	6.58	0.61	Strongly Agree
Encourage open dialogue between school leadership and the school community.	6.27	0.77	Strongly Agree
Address misunderstandings promptly through effective clarification.	6.26	0.78	Strongly Agree
Encourage feedback from teachers, students, parents, and community members.	6.30	0.74	Strongly Agree
Strengthen collaboration by ensuring two-way communication in decision-making.	6.39	0.76	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.36		
SD	0.57		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 11 presents the level of school leaders’ strategies in terms of adaptive leadership approaches. The overall weighted mean of 6.36, with a standard deviation of 0.57, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that school leaders practice adaptive leadership to a very great extent. The relatively low standard deviation signifies consistency in the responses, indicating that respondents commonly perceive school heads as flexible and responsive in managing school dynamics. This implies that adaptability is a defining characteristic of leadership within the School-Based Management framework.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.58 was recorded for “Establish clear channels of communication among teachers, staff, and stakeholders.” This implies that structured and transparent communication systems are strongly prioritized in leadership practice.

It indicates that clear communication pathways serve as a foundation for coordination, collaboration, and shared understanding. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.26 was obtained for “Address misunderstandings promptly through effective clarification,” although it remains interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that while misunderstandings are actively managed, sustaining consistent clarity in all interactions requires continuous effort. The narrow range of

means across statements signifies that all aspects of adaptive leadership are consistently demonstrated.

Table 12 presents the composite level of school leaders’ strategies in capacity-building programs, communication enhancement, and adaptive leadership. The overall mean of 5.94, with a standard deviation of 0.70, is interpreted as Very High. This indicates that school leaders implement strategic leadership practices to a great extent. The moderate standard deviation indicates reasonable consistency in responses, though slight variations in how these strategies are applied across schools exist. This implies that while strategic initiatives are actively practiced, their intensity and focus may differ depending on institutional priorities and contextual factors.

Table 12. Composite Level of School Leaders’ Strategies

Indicators	Weighted Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Capacity building Programs	5.84	0.74	Very High
Enhancing Communication Strategies	5.63	0.78	Very High
Adaptive Leadership Approaches	6.36	0.57	Extremely High
Grand Mean	5.94	0.70	Very High

Table 12 presents the composite level of school leaders’ strategies in capacity-building programs, communication enhancement, and adaptive leadership. The overall mean of 5.94, with a standard deviation of 0.70, is interpreted as Very High. This indicates that school leaders implement strategic leadership practices to a great extent. The moderate standard deviation indicates reasonable consistency in responses, though slight variations in how these strategies are applied across schools exist. This implies that while strategic initiatives are actively practiced, their intensity and focus may differ depending on institutional priorities and contextual factors.

Among the indicators, Adaptive Leadership Approaches obtained the highest weighted mean of 6.36, which is verbally interpreted as Extremely High. This implies that flexibility, responsiveness, and collaborative communication are the most strongly demonstrated strategies among school leaders. It indicates that adaptability plays a central role in navigating change and managing school dynamics. In contrast, Enhancing Communication Strategies recorded the lowest weighted mean of 5.63, although still interpreted as Very High. This indicates that communication strategies are consistently practiced but may require further strengthening to match the intensity of adaptive leadership approaches. The noticeable difference

between adaptive leadership and the other two indicators signifies variation in emphasis among strategic practices. Overall, the findings indicate that school leaders demonstrate a strong commitment to strategic management within the SBM framework.

The consistently high ratings signify that professional development, communication enhancement, and adaptive practices are integral to their leadership approach. This implies that strategic leadership contributes to organizational resilience, staff development, and sustained school improvement. Furthermore, a higher rating for adaptive leadership indicates that responsiveness to change remains a dominant strategy for ensuring effective school operations and resource management.

Level of Resource Mobilization in Managing SBM

In this study, the level of resource mobilization in managing School-Based Management (SBM) is examined across resource availability and utilization, financial transparency and accountability, partnerships and network strength, and innovation and improvement projects. The findings determine the extent to which schools effectively generate, allocate, and sustain resources, and indicate how these practices support operational efficiency, stakeholder trust, and long-term school development.

Table 13. Level of Resource Mobilization in Managing SBM in Terms of Resource Availability and Utilization

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Ensure adequate learning materials and teaching resources are available.	6.48	0.67	Strongly Agree
Allocate school funds effectively to support instructional and operational needs.	6.35	0.75	Strongly Agree
Secure external support from stakeholders to supplement limited resources.	6.27	0.85	Strongly Agree
Implement transparent practices in resource allocation and disbursement.	6.27	0.87	Strongly Agree
Develop strategies to sustain resources for long-term school improvement.	6.45	0.78	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.34		
SD	0.72		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 13 presents the level of resource mobilization for School-Based Management (SBM), including resource availability and utilization. The overall weighted mean of 6.34, with a standard deviation of 0.72, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that practices related to ensuring and managing resources are carried out to a great extent. The moderate standard deviation indicates general consistency in responses, though slight variations in how resource strategies are implemented across schools. This implies that resource management is a strong operational priority in SBM implementation.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.48 was recorded for “Ensure availability of adequate learning materials and teaching resources.” This implies that providing sufficient instructional resources is a central focus of school management and indicates strong attention to supporting classroom instruction. Closely followed is “Develop strategies to sustain resources for long-term school improvement,” with

a mean of 6.45, indicating forward planning and sustainability efforts. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.27 was obtained for both “Secure external support from stakeholders to supplement limited resources” and “Implement transparent practices in resource allocation and disbursement,” although both remain interpreted as Strongly Agree.

These results indicate that while external partnerships and transparency measures are actively practiced, sustaining consistent engagement and maintaining systematic transparency require continuous effort and monitoring. Overall, the findings indicate that resource availability and utilization are effectively managed within the SBM framework. The consistently high ratings signify that school leaders prioritize both the provision and sustainability of resources to support instructional and operational needs. This implies that strategic allocation, accountability, and long-term planning are integral to maintaining school improvement initiatives and ensuring that available resources directly contribute to enhanced educational outcomes.

Table 14. Level of Resource Mobilization in Managing SBM in Terms of Financial Transparency and Accountability

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Present the school funds’ financial statements clearly to stakeholders.	6.44	0.73	Strongly Agree
Ensure proper documentation of all income and expenditures.	6.53	0.61	Strongly Agree
Adhere to government and DepEd regulations in financial management.	6.59	0.70	Strongly Agree
Involve stakeholders in reviewing and approving budget allocations.	6.51	0.68	Strongly Agree
Transparently address financial concerns and irregularities.	6.59	0.65	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.55		
SD	0.57		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 14 presents the level of resource mobilization in managing School-Based Management (SBM) in terms of financial transparency and accountability. The overall weighted mean of 6.55, with a standard deviation of 0.57, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that financial transparency and accountability practices are implemented to a great extent. The relatively low standard deviation indicates strong consistency in responses, suggesting that school leaders uniformly uphold accountability standards in financial management. This implies that responsible stewardship of school funds is a firmly established practice within SBM implementation.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.59 was recorded for both “Adhere to government and DepEd regulations in financial management” and “Transparently address financial concerns and irregularities.” These results imply that compliance with regulatory standards and the proactive management of financial issues are central priorities for school leadership.

They indicate that school heads place strong emphasis on integrity and adherence to established financial policies.

In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.44 was obtained for “Present the financial statements of the school funds clearly to stakeholders,” although it remains interpreted as Strongly

Agree. This indicates that financial reporting to stakeholders is consistently practiced, yet maintaining clarity and accessibility of financial information requires continuous effort to ensure shared understanding.

Overall, the findings indicate that financial transparency and accountability are critical strengths in managing SBM. The consistently high ratings signify that systematic documentation, stakeholder involvement, and strict adherence to policies guide financial operations within schools. This implies that strong accountability mechanisms foster institutional trust, enhance stakeholder confidence, and support sustainable resource management aligned with educational goals.

Table 15. Level of Resource Mobilization in Managing SBM in Terms of Partnerships and Network Strength

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Establish partnerships with local government units to support school programs.	6.46	0.68	Strongly Agree
Collaborate with NGOs, civic groups, and private organizations to share resources.	6.25	0.80	Strongly Agree
Strengthen alumni involvement in school improvement initiatives.	6.19	0.89	Strongly Agree
Seek external funding support from corporate social responsibility programs.	6.07	0.98	Agree
Engage parents and guardians in mobilizing resources for school needs.	6.33	0.88	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.21		
SD	0.75		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 15 presents the level of resource mobilization in managing School-Based Management (SBM) in terms of partnerships and network strength. The overall weighted mean of 6.21, with a standard deviation of 0.75, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that school leaders practice partnership-building and network development to a great extent. The moderate standard deviation signifies some variation in responses, indicating that while partnerships are actively pursued, the degree of network expansion may differ across schools. This implies that external collaboration is a recognized strategy in strengthening school resources under the SBM framework.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.46 was recorded for “Establish partnerships with local government units to support school programs.” This implies that collaboration with local government remains a primary avenue for resource support and institutional assistance. It indicates that school leaders actively coordinate with public sector partners to sustain school initiatives. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.07 was obtained for “Seek external funding support from corporate social responsibility programs,” which is interpreted as Agree. This indicates that while corporate partnerships are pursued, accessing and sustaining such funding opportunities may pose greater challenges than local or community-based partnerships. The relatively higher standard deviation for this item indicates that schools differ in their experiences with engaging private-sector support.

Overall, the findings indicate that partnerships and network strength play a significant role in enhancing resource mobilization. The consistently high ratings signify that school

leaders engage multiple stakeholders, including government units, non-government organizations, alumni, and parents, to support school development efforts. This implies that diversified collaboration strengthens institutional capacity, expands available resources, and contributes to the sustainability of school programs within the SBM framework.

Table 16. Level of Resource Mobilization in Managing SBM in Terms of Innovation and Improvement Projects

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Develop innovative projects that address school needs and priorities.	6.40	0.73	Strongly Agree
Introduce creative solutions to maximize limited resources	6.18	0.78	Strongly Agree
Implement school-based improvement projects that enhance learning outcomes.	6.26	0.81	Strongly Agree
Utilize technology to support innovative teaching and school operations.	6.30	0.77	Strongly Agree
Mobilize stakeholders to support improvement and innovation projects.	6.29	0.78	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.26		
SD	0.61		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 16 presents the level of resource mobilization in managing School-Based Management (SBM) in terms of innovation and improvement projects. The overall weighted mean of 6.26, with a standard deviation of 0.61, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that innovation and improvement initiatives are implemented extensively in schools. The relatively low standard deviation suggests consistent responses, indicating that school leaders commonly engage in project-based innovations to address institutional needs. This implies that continuous improvement is embedded in school management practices under the SBM framework.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.40 was recorded for “Develop innovative projects that address school needs and priorities.”

This implies that school leaders actively design context-based initiatives aligned with identified institutional concerns. It indicates that innovation is strategically directed toward priority areas rather than applied randomly. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.18 was obtained for “Introduce creative solutions to maximize limited resources,” although it remains interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that while creative resource optimization is practiced, maximizing limited resources requires ongoing strategic planning and adaptability. The close proximity of the mean scores indicates that all aspects of innovation and improvement are consistently pursued.

Overall, the findings indicate that innovation and improvement projects significantly contribute to effective resource mobilization in SBM. The consistently high ratings signify that school leaders integrate technology, stakeholder participation, and strategic planning in implementing school-based initiatives.

Table 17 presents the composite level of resource mobilization for School-Based Management (SBM) across resource availability and utilization, financial transparency and accountability, partnerships and network strength, and innovation and improvement projects. The overall mean is

verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicating that resource mobilization practices are carried out to a very great extent. The standard deviations across indicators indicate reasonable consistency in responses, suggesting that schools generally adopt similar approaches to managing and sustaining their resources. This implies that resource mobilization is a well-established component of SBM implementation.

Table 17. Composite Level of Resource Mobilization in Managing SBM

Indicators	Weighted Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Resource availability and utilization	6.34	0.72	Extremely High
Financial Transparency and Accountability	6.55	0.57	Extremely High
Partnerships and Network Strength	6.21	0.75	Extremely High
Innovation and Improvement Projects	6.26	0.61	Extremely High
Grand Mean	6.34	0.66	Extremely High

Among the indicators, Financial Transparency and Accountability had the highest weighted mean of 6.55, indicating that compliance with regulations, proper documentation, and transparent reporting are strongly embedded in school financial management. This indicates that accountability mechanisms are firmly practiced to maintain stakeholder trust and institutional integrity. In contrast, Partnerships and Network Strength recorded the lowest weighted mean of 6.21, although still interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that while external collaborations are actively pursued, expanding and strengthening broader networks may require continuous engagement and strategic outreach. The relatively narrow range of means across the indicators indicates balanced attention to the different dimensions of resource mobilization.

Overall, the findings indicate that schools demonstrate strong capacity to mobilize and manage resources to support instructional and operational goals. The consistently high ratings signify that transparency, sustainability planning, innovation, and collaboration collectively contribute to effective SBM management. This implies that comprehensive resource mobilization practices enhance organizational stability, strengthen stakeholder confidence, and support sustained school improvement efforts.

Level of School Operation in Managing SBM

In this study, the level of school operations in managing School-Based Management (SBM) is examined across school planning and development, personnel and human resource management, monitoring and evaluation, and student services and support. The findings determine the extent to which operational systems and management practices are implemented and indicate how these processes contribute to institutional efficiency, accountability, and the sustained delivery of quality educational services.

Table 18 presents the level of school operations in managing School-Based Management (SBM) in school planning and development. The overall weighted mean of 6.47, with a standard deviation of 0.59, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that school planning and

development processes are implemented to a very great extent. The relatively low standard deviation indicates strong consistency in responses, suggesting that school leaders share similar practices in planning, evaluating, and revising development initiatives. This implies that structured and goal-oriented planning is firmly embedded in SBM implementation.

Table 18. Level of School Operation in Managing SBM in Terms of School Planning and Development

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Formulate clear and realistic school improvement plans aligned with SBM goals.	6.49	0.67	Strongly Agree
Identify priority development areas based on school needs assessments.	6.51	0.68	Strongly Agree
Align school planning with DepEd policies and national education priorities	6.51	0.67	Strongly Agree
Evaluate the outcomes of school planning to inform future initiatives.	6.39	0.77	Strongly Agree
Revise school development plans based on feedback and emerging needs.	6.46	0.73	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.47		
SD	0.59		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.51 was recorded for both “Identify priority areas for development based on school needs assessments” and “Align school planning with DepEd policies and national education priorities.” These findings suggest that school operations are heavily reliant on data-driven planning and policy alignment. They indicate that school leaders ensure that development initiatives are both responsive to institutional needs and consistent with national standards. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.39 was obtained for “Evaluate the outcomes of school planning to inform future initiatives,” although it remains interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that while evaluation is consistently practiced, strengthening systematic assessment mechanisms may further enhance planning effectiveness. The close proximity of the means indicates balanced attention across all aspects of planning and development.

Overall, the findings indicate that school planning and development significantly contribute to effective SBM management. The consistently high ratings signify that schools adopt strategic, aligned, and responsive planning processes. This implies that continuous assessment, alignment with educational policies, and responsiveness to emerging needs strengthen institutional direction, promote accountability, and support sustained school improvement.

Table 19 presents the level of school operation in managing School-Based Management (SBM) in terms of personnel and human resource management. The overall weighted mean of 6.48, with a standard deviation of 0.63, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that personnel and human resource management practices are implemented to a very great extent. The relatively low standard deviation suggests consistent responses, indicating that school leaders commonly apply structured, systematic approaches to managing their staff.

Table 19. Level of School Operation in Managing SBM in Terms of Personnel and Human Resource Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Recruit and assign personnel based on qualifications and competencies.	6.51	0.64	Strongly Agree
Provide orientation and induction programs for newly hired staff.	6.46	0.82	Strongly Agree
Monitor staff performance through regular appraisal and feedback.	6.48	0.71	Strongly Agree
Recognize and reward the outstanding performance of teachers and staff.	6.46	0.81	Strongly Agree
Implement policies on discipline, ethics, and accountability in personnel management.	6.51	0.66	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.48		
SD	0.63		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

This implies that effective human resource management is a strong operational foundation in SBM implementation.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.51 was recorded for both “Recruit and assign personnel based on qualifications and competencies” and “Implement policies on discipline, ethics, and accountability in personnel management.” These findings imply that merit-based assignment and policy-driven accountability are central priorities in managing school personnel. They indicate that school leaders emphasize competence, professionalism, and adherence to standards in staffing decisions. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.46 was obtained for “Provide orientation and induction programs for newly hired staff” and “Recognize and reward the outstanding performance of teachers and staff,” although both remain interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that while support and recognition mechanisms are consistently practiced, sustaining comprehensive onboarding and recognition systems requires continuous attention. The narrow range of means signifies balanced implementation across all aspects of personnel management.

Overall, the findings indicate that strong human resource practices contribute significantly to effective school operations under SBM. Consistent high ratings show that maintaining organizational efficiency and employee motivation depends on recruiting, overseeing, recognizing, and enforcing policy. This implies that structured personnel management strengthens institutional stability, enhances staff performance, and supports sustained school improvement efforts.

Table 20. Level of Resource Mobilization in Managing SBM in Terms of Monitoring and Evaluation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Establish clear indicators to measure school performance and progress.	6.36	0.78	Strongly Agree
Consistently monitor the implementation of school programs and projects.	6.17	0.84	Strongly Agree
Provide timely feedback to teachers and staff based on monitoring results.	6.25	0.81	Strongly Agree
Document best practices and lessons learned for future reference.	6.18	0.87	Strongly Agree
Promote accountability by reporting, monitoring, and evaluating results to stakeholders.	6.35	0.82	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.24		
SD	0.71		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 20 presents the level of school operation in managing School-Based Management (SBM) in terms of monitoring and evaluation. The overall weighted mean of 6.24, with a standard deviation of 0.71, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that monitoring and evaluation practices are implemented to a very great extent within the school system. The moderate standard deviation signifies reasonable consistency in the responses, indicating that school leaders generally apply structured monitoring mechanisms, although implementation intensity may vary slightly across contexts. This implies that performance tracking and accountability processes are integral components of SBM management.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.36 was recorded for “Establish clear indicators to measure school performance and progress.” This implies that school leaders prioritize measurable standards in assessing institutional effectiveness. It indicates that defined benchmarks guide decision-making and performance review processes. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.17 was obtained for “Monitor the implementation of school programs and projects consistently,” although still interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that while monitoring is ongoing, sustaining continuous, systematic follow-through across all programs may require ongoing coordination and resource support. The close proximity of the mean scores indicates that all monitoring-related practices are consistently carried out.

Overall, the findings indicate that monitoring and evaluation significantly contribute to operational effectiveness in SBM implementation. The consistently high ratings signify that school leaders emphasize accountability, documentation of best practices, and performance reporting. This implies that structured evaluation mechanisms strengthen transparency, inform strategic planning, and support continuous improvement in school operations and program implementation.

Table 21. Level of Resource Mobilization in Managing SBM in Terms of Student Services and Support

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Provide guidance and counseling services to address students’ academic and personal needs.	6.44	0.73	Strongly Agree
Ensure access to health and nutrition programs that promote student well-being.	6.40	0.75	Strongly Agree
Implement support services for students with special needs and learning difficulties.	6.44	0.83	Strongly Agree
Facilitate co-curricular and extracurricular activities for holistic student development.	6.36	0.79	Strongly Agree
Strengthen programs that promote student leadership and participation.	6.52	0.68	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.43		
SD	0.58		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 21 presents the level of school operation in managing School-Based Management (SBM) in terms of student services and support. The overall weighted mean of 6.43, with a standard deviation of 0.58, is interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that student services and support systems are implemented to a very great extent. The

relatively low standard deviation suggests consistent responses, indicating that schools commonly prioritize programs that promote students' academic success, well-being, and holistic development. This implies that student-centered practices are firmly embedded in SBM implementation.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 6.52 was recorded for "Strengthen programs that promote student leadership and participation." This implies that empowering students and encouraging active engagement are strongly emphasized in school operations. It indicates recognition of student involvement as a key component of holistic development. In contrast, the lowest mean of 6.36 was obtained for "Facilitate co-curricular and extra-curricular activities for holistic student development," although it remains interpreted as Strongly Agree. This indicates that while enrichment activities are consistently implemented, sustaining a wide range of programs requires ongoing planning and resource allocation. The close range of mean scores signifies balanced attention across all areas of student support.

Overall, the findings indicate that comprehensive student services significantly contribute to effective school operations within the SBM framework. The consistently high ratings signify that guidance services, health programs, inclusive support, and leadership development initiatives are integral to school management. This implies that strong student support mechanisms enhance well-being, promote active participation, and reinforce the overall effectiveness of SBM in fostering holistic educational outcomes.

Table 22. Composite Level of School Operation in Managing SBM

Indicators	Weighted Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
School Planning and Development	6.47	0.59	Extremely High
Personnel and Human Resource Management	6.48	0.63	Extremely High
Monitoring and Evaluation	6.24	0.71	Extremely High
Student services and Support	6.43	0.58	Extremely High
Grand Mean	6.41	0.63	Extremely High

Table 22 presents the composite level of school operations in managing School-Based Management (SBM) across school planning and development, personnel and human resource

management, monitoring and evaluation, and student services and support. The overall mean of 6.41 with a standard deviation of 0.63 is verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicating that school operations are implemented to a very great extent. The relatively low standard deviation indicates consistent responses, suggesting that operational practices are uniformly carried out across schools within the SBM framework.

Among the indicators, Personnel and Human Resource Management had the highest weighted mean of 6.48, indicating that staffing, performance monitoring, and accountability systems are strongly institutionalized. This indicates that effective human resource management is a key operational strength. In contrast, Monitoring and Evaluation recorded the lowest weighted mean of 6.24, although still interpreted as Extremely High. This indicates that while evaluation mechanisms are consistently implemented, enhancing systematic documentation and continuous assessment processes may further strengthen operational effectiveness. The close proximity of the means indicates balanced attention across all operational dimensions.

Overall, the findings indicate that school operations under SBM are comprehensive and well-coordinated. The consistently high ratings signify that planning, personnel management, monitoring systems, and student support services collectively contribute to institutional efficiency and accountability. This implies that integrated operational practices reinforce organizational stability and sustain the overall effectiveness of SBM implementation.

Table 23 presents the relationship between school leaders' challenges and resource mobilization and school operations in managing School-Based Management (SBM) using Pearson product-moment correlation analysis. The results show varying degrees of association across the different operational indicators. Correlation coefficients range from moderate to strong, with several statistically significant relationships observed at the 0.05 level of significance. Significant positive correlations were found between dimensions of leadership challenges and various components of resource mobilization and school operations, while some indicators demonstrated non-significant relationships.

Table 23. Relationship of School Leaders' Challenges on the Resource Mobilization and School Operation in Managing SBM

		RAU	FTA	PNS	IIP	SPD	PHRM	ME	SSS
Time Management	Pearson Correlation	.664**	.693**	.509	.595	.718**	.682**	.588	.544
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.337	.000	.007	.000	.452	.223
	N	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113
Role Ambiguity	Pearson Correlation	.736**	.671**	.469	.535**	.569	.612**	.454*	.486
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.103	.020	.412	.000	.046	.126
	N	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113
Workload Distribution	Pearson Correlation	.697	.675	.597**	.687	.492**	.638*	.518**	.558**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.453	.445	.000	.151	.013	.033	.000	.000
	N	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113

In terms of statistical decision, the null hypothesis is partially rejected. Significant relationships exist between school leaders' challenges and several aspects of resource mobilization and school operations. For instance, Role

Ambiguity shows a strong positive correlation with resource availability and utilization ($r = .736, p = .000$) and a significant relationship with financial transparency and accountability ($r = .671, p = .000$). Similarly, Time

Management demonstrates significant relationships with school planning and development ($r = .718, p = .007$) and personnel and human resource management ($r = .682, p = .000$). These findings indicate that the manner in which leaders manage time and clarify roles is associated with stronger planning systems, financial management practices, and personnel coordination. Workload Distribution also exhibits significant relationships with partnerships and network strength ($r = .597, p = .000$), monitoring and evaluation ($r = .518, p = .000$), and student services and support ($r = .558, p = .000$), implying that equitable task allocation is connected with collaborative networks and structured operational processes. Among the three dimensions, Role Ambiguity shows the strongest relationships, particularly with resource availability and utilization. This signifies that clarity in administrative and instructional functions is closely associated with effective resource management. Workload Distribution also shows

consistent significant relationships across multiple operational indicators, signifying its influence on collaboration and service delivery systems. However, several correlations were found to be non-significant, particularly in partnerships and certain operational areas, indicating that not all aspects of leadership challenges uniformly influence every dimension of SBM management.

Overall, the findings indicate that school leaders' challenges are meaningfully associated with key components of resource mobilization and school operations. The presence of multiple significant positive correlations signifies that leadership challenges are directly linked to how schools organize resources, implement plans, and manage personnel and student services. These results imply that effectively addressing time constraints, role clarity, and workload balance contributes to strengthened SBM implementation and improved operational performance.

Table 24. Relationship of School Leaders' Responsibilities on the Resource Mobilization and School Operation in Managing SBM

		RAU	FTA	PNS	IIP	SPD	PHRM	ME	SSP
Instructional Leadership	Pearson Correlation	.752**	.794**	.716**	.737**	.717	.731**	.721**	.873**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.020	.017	.446	.000	.004	.002
	N	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113
Stakeholder Engagement	Pearson Correlation	.792**	.836**	.641**	.674	.780	.793**	.644**	.825**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.020	.006	.003	.199	.097	.000	.000	.000
	N	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113
Policy Implementation	Pearson Correlation	.651**	.728**	.671	.697**	.936	.726**	.938**	.192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.135	.003	.078	.000	.000	.192
	N	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113

Table 24 presents the relationship between school leaders' responsibilities and resource mobilization and school operations in managing School-Based Management (SBM) using Pearson product-moment correlation analysis. The results show predominantly strong positive correlations across most operational indicators. Several statistically significant relationships were observed at the 0.05 level, indicating that leadership responsibilities are closely associated with effective resource mobilization and school operational systems.

In terms of statistical decision, the null hypothesis stating that school leaders' responsibilities do not have a significant relationship with resource mobilization and school operations in managing SBM is rejected. Significant relationships were found across multiple indicators. Instructional Leadership shows strong significant correlations with resource availability and utilization ($r = .752, p = .001$), financial transparency and accountability ($r = .794, p = .000$), personnel and human resource management ($r = .731, p = .000$), monitoring and evaluation ($r = .721, p = .004$), and student services and support ($r = .873, p = .002$). Stakeholder Engagement also demonstrates significant relationships with resource availability and utilization ($r = .792, p = .020$), financial transparency and accountability ($r = .836, p = .006$), partnerships and network strength ($r = .641, p = .003$), personnel and human resource management ($r = .793, p = .000$), monitoring and evaluation ($r = .644, p = .000$), and student services and support ($r = .825, p = .000$). These findings indicate that active instructional supervision and collaborative engagement are strongly associated with

strengthened financial systems, personnel management, and student support services.

Among the dimensions, Policy Implementation exhibits some of the strongest correlations, particularly with monitoring and evaluation ($r = .938, p = .000$) and personnel and human resource management ($r = .726, p = .000$). This signifies that consistent enforcement of policies is closely associated with structured monitoring mechanisms and organized human resource systems. Although a few relationships were found to be non-significant, particularly with student services and support, the overall pattern demonstrates strong and meaningful associations across most variables.

Overall, the findings indicate that school leaders' responsibilities are significantly related to resource mobilization and school operations in managing SBM. The consistently high correlation coefficients signify that instructional leadership, stakeholder engagement, and policy implementation collectively enhance operational efficiency, accountability systems, and institutional effectiveness. According to Allen et al. (2018), school leaders use policy to establish standards, ensure consistency, support vision and mission statements, meet accreditation requirements, and/or guide day-to-day practices. It is a requirement for most schools to have a supporting policy that is, at a minimum, known and accessible to parents, staff, and in some circumstances, students.

Table 25 presents the relationship between school leaders' strategies and resource mobilization and school operations in

managing School-Based Management (SBM) using Pearson product-moment correlation analysis. The results show varying degrees of association across the different operational indicators. While capacity-building programs and enhancing communication strategies exhibit negligible correlation

coefficients despite statistically significant p-values, adaptive leadership approaches demonstrate moderate to strong positive correlations with several dimensions of resource mobilization and school operations.

Table 25. Relationship of School Leaders' Strategies on the Resource Mobilization and School Operation in Managing SBM

		RAU	FTA	PNS	IIP	SPD	PHRM	ME	SSP
Capacity Building Programs	Pearson Correlation	.016**	-.040**	.007**	-.050**	.111**	.015**	.069**	-.010**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113
Enhancing Communication Strategies	Pearson Correlation	.024**	-.040**	.082**	.018**	.150**	.049**	.150**	-.050**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113
Adaptive Leadership Approaches	Pearson Correlation	.649**	.656**	.595**	.703*	.426	.625**	.433**	.665**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.006	.018	.046	.357	.000	.014	.013
	N	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113

In terms of statistical decision, the null hypothesis stating that school leaders' strategies do not have a significant relationship with resource mobilization and school operations in managing SBM is partially rejected. For Capacity Building Programs and Enhancing Communication Strategies, the correlation coefficients are very weak (r values ranging from -.050 to .150), indicating negligible practical relationships with the operational variables despite statistical significance. These results imply that although statistical significance is present, the strength of association is minimal and does not indicate substantial influence. In contrast, Adaptive Leadership Approaches show significant positive correlations with resource availability and utilization (r = .649, p = .010), financial transparency and accountability (r = .656, p = .006), partnerships and network strength (r = .595, p = .018), innovation and improvement projects (r = .703, p = .046), personnel and human resource management (r = .625, p = .000), monitoring and evaluation (r = .433, p = .014), and student services and support (r = .665, p = .013). These findings indicate that adaptive leadership is meaningfully associated with stronger operational systems and resource mobilization practices.

Among the strategic dimensions, Adaptive Leadership Approaches consistently exhibit the strongest and most meaningful relationships across multiple operational indicators. This signifies that flexibility, responsiveness, and collaborative decision-making are closely linked to effective resource management and operational efficiency. Overall, the findings indicate that while certain strategic practices demonstrate limited practical association, adaptive leadership plays a significant role in strengthening SBM implementation. These results imply that responsiveness to change and contextual adaptability are key strategic drivers in enhancing school performance and sustainability.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first hypothesis, which stated that school heads' challenges do not have a significant relationship with resource mobilization and school operations in the management of School-Based Management (SBM), was rejected. The results indicate that school leaders' challenges significantly influence

both resource mobilization and school operations, demonstrating that effective time management, role clarity, and workload distribution positively affect the school's capacity to utilize resources efficiently and maintain smooth operational processes under SBM.

The second hypothesis, which stated that school heads' responsibilities do not have a significant relationship with resource mobilization and school operations in the management of SBM, was also rejected. The findings show that school leaders' responsibilities significantly affect resource management and school operations, underscoring that strong instructional leadership, stakeholder engagement, and policy implementation enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of SBM practices.

The third hypothesis, which stated that school heads' strategies do not have a significant relationship with resource mobilization and school operations in the management of SBM, was likewise rejected. The results reveal that school leaders' strategies, including capacity-building programs, enhanced communication, and adaptive leadership approaches, significantly contribute to the successful mobilization of resources and the overall management of school operations within the SBM framework.

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following is recommended.

It was recommended that school leaders improve the management of challenges by enhancing time management practices, clearly defining roles, and ensuring equitable workload distribution to strengthen school operations and efficiency in SBM.

It was recommended that school leaders strengthen their roles in instructional leadership, actively engage stakeholders, and effectively implement policies to promote a responsive and well-organized school environment.

It was recommended that school leaders continue to develop and sustain effective strategies, including capacity building, clear communication, and adaptive leadership, to address emerging challenges and support continuous school improvement.

It was recommended that schools enhance their efforts in resource mobilization by promoting transparency in financial

management, building strong partnerships, and adopting innovative initiatives to sustain and improve school programs.

Future researchers are encouraged to further examine how school leaders' challenges, responsibilities, and strategies affect resource mobilization and school operations in managing SBM. Studies may examine the roles of leadership practices, stakeholder engagement, adaptive strategies, and innovation projects in school performance. Additionally, factors such as school culture, community involvement, and technology integration can be investigated to provide deeper insights for enhancing the effective implementation of SBM.

It is recommended that school operations, including planning, personnel management, monitoring and evaluation,

and student services, be continuously reviewed and improved to achieve the goals of SBM effectively and efficiently.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Sheninger (2024) Cultivating Leadership: Strategies for Building Capacity <https://esheninger.blogspot.com/2024/01/cultivating-leadership-strategies-for.html>.
- [2]. Tipurić, D. (2022). The rise of strategic leadership. In *The enactment of strategic leadership*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-03103799-3_3
- [3]. Yukl, G. A., & Gardner, W. L. (2020). *Leadership in organizations* (9th ed.) Pearson Education, Inc