

School Heads' Management Capabilities and Competencies on the Implementation of the Revised SBM: Basis for an SBM Implementation Improvement Plan

Anna Dominique San Juan Delfina

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: julierosemendoza002@gmail.com

Abstract— This study deals with School Heads' Management Capabilities, Competencies, and the Implementation of the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) dimensions. Specifically, it aimed to determine the level of school heads' management capabilities, competencies, and the implementation of the Revised SBM dimensions. It also examined the relationship between management capabilities and competencies to the implementation of SBM. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from 257 educators through simple random sampling technique. A single-method approach was utilized using a researcher-made questionnaire to collect the necessary data. It employed a 7-point Likert scale to assess the School Heads Management Capabilities and Competencies, and Implementation of the Revised School-Based Management. The data was treated statistically using weighted mean and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The findings showed that the level of school heads' management capabilities, competencies, and the implementation of the Revised SBM dimensions were high across all major domains. Furthermore, the results showed a statistically significant relationship between school heads' management capabilities and the implementation of SBM. Likewise, a significant relationship was found between school heads' competencies and SBM implementation. The study established that both management capabilities and competencies of school heads are significantly related to the effective implementation of the Revised SBM dimensions that leads to rejection of both hypotheses. This indicates that strong leadership competencies and effective management practices greatly influence the success of SBM implementation. This study recommends implementation of a comprehensive SBM Implementation Improvement Plan focusing on strengthening school heads' competencies and management capabilities. It is anticipated that enhancing these leadership dimensions will improve school governance, promote effective collaboration among stakeholders, and ensure better educational outcomes aligned with the goals of the Revised SBM framework.

Keywords— School-Based Management, school heads' management capabilities, competencies, educational leadership, SBM implementation

I. INTRODUCTION

Education is widely recognized as a fundamental driver of national development and social progress, as it equips individuals with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to contribute meaningfully to society. In the global context, improving education quality remains a key priority aligned

with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which emphasizes inclusive, equitable, and quality education for all. Achieving this goal requires effective education governance and strong leadership at the school level (UNESCO, 2023).

In the Philippines, education reforms have increasingly focused on decentralization, granting schools greater autonomy and responsibility in managing their operations to better address the needs of learners. One of the key strategies supporting this reform is School-Based Management (SBM), which empowers school heads and stakeholders to make informed decisions on planning, budgeting, and resource utilization. By involving those closest to the learners' school heads, teachers, and the community, SBM aims to promote a more responsive, participatory, and accountable education system (Department of Education, 2024).

However, the effectiveness of SBM largely depends on the management capabilities and leadership competencies of school heads, who play a critical role in translating policies into practice and ensuring improved school performance. Studies show that variations in leadership capacity significantly affect the quality of SBM implementation and school outcomes (Pascua, 2024).

In this regard, this study aims to develop a School Leadership Strengthening Plan that will enhance the management capabilities and competencies of school heads in relation to the implementation of the Revised SBM. The proposed plan is intended to guide capacity-building programs, leadership development initiatives, and governance improvement efforts that support more effective school management and accountability.

Thus, the study titled "School Heads' Management Capabilities and Competencies on the Implementation of the Revised SBM: A Basis for an SBM Implementation Improvement Plan" is undertaken, emphasizing the crucial role of school leadership in strengthening school governance, fostering collaboration, and improving learner outcomes.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

This study determined the relationship between the school heads' management capabilities and competencies and the implementation of the Revised School-Based Management

(SBM) dimensions as outlined in DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024. The results of this investigation will serve as the basis for the development of a School-Based Management (SBM) Implementation Improvement Plan.

Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of the school heads' management capabilities in terms of:
 - 1.1. financial and resource management;
 - 1.2. human resource systems management;
 - 1.3. data-based planning and monitoring;
 - 1.4. partnership and resource mobilization;
 - 1.5. stakeholder governance mechanisms; and
 - 1.6. instructional systems management?
2. What is the level of the school heads' competencies in terms of:
 - 2.1. strategic and visionary thinking;
 - 2.2. emotional intelligence;
 - 2.3. ethical professionalism;
 - 2.4. innovation and improvement;
 - 2.5. communication skills; and
 - 2.6. community relationship-building orientation?
3. What is the level of implementation of the Revised SBM dimensions in terms of:
 - 3.1. curriculum and teaching;
 - 3.2. learning environment;
 - 3.3. leadership;
 - 3.4. governance and accountability;
 - 3.5. human resource and team development; and
 - 3.6. finance and resource management and mobilization?
4. Is there a significant relationship between school heads' management capabilities and the implementation of the Revised SBM dimensions?
5. Is there a significant relationship between school heads' competencies and the implementation of the Revised SBM dimensions?

II. METHODOLOGY

Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from 257 educators through simple random sampling technique. A single-method approach was utilized using a researcher-made questionnaire to collect the necessary data. It employed a 7-point Likert scale to assess the School Heads Management Capabilities and Competencies, and Implementation of the Revised School-Based Management. The data was treated statistically using weighted mean and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the different results and discusses the results from treating the data gathered in this study. It presents the data gathered about the significant relationship between School Heads' Management Capabilities and Competencies on the implementation of the revised SBM. In particular, the study sought to address the following:

Level of School Heads' Management Capabilities

In this study, the level of School Heads' management capabilities refers to their effectiveness in Financial and Resource Management, Human Resource Systems Management, Data-Based Planning and Monitoring, Partnership and Resource Mobilization, Stakeholder Governance Mechanisms, and Instructional Systems Management. These collectively describe the school heads' ability to manage school operations, optimize resources, strengthen partnerships, ensure accountability, and support instructional leadership.

The following tables present the statements, corresponding mean scores, standard deviations, remarks, and verbal interpretations based on the responses of the participants. In Table 1, respondents indicated that school heads consistently demonstrate very high management capabilities in terms of Financial and Resource Management across all assessed indicators. Notably, successfully mobilizing donations through adopt-a-school initiatives to fill resource gaps obtained the highest mean score (Mean = 6.79, SD = 0.41), suggesting that school heads are highly proactive in securing additional resources to support school needs. Similarly, regularly monitoring the liquidation of school MOOE and funds, maintaining transparency in the use of school facilities and equipment, and ensuring proper inventory and maintenance of school assets were all rated very high, reflecting strong financial oversight and accountability practices. Allocating the school budget based on prioritized learning needs (Mean = 6.58, SD = 0.69), while slightly lower than the other indicators, still falls within the very high category.

Table 1. Level of the School Heads' Management Capabilities in terms of Financial and Resource Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...allots the school budget based on prioritized learning needs.	6.58	0.69	Always
...regularly monitors the liquidation of school MOOE and funds.	6.75	0.50	Always
...maintains transparency in the use of school facilities and equipment.	6.75	0.53	Always
...ensures the proper inventory and maintenance of school assets.	6.75	0.43	Always
...successfully mobilizes donations (adopt-a-school) to fill resource gaps.	6.79	0.41	Always
Weighted Mean	6.72		
SD	0.35		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Moreover, the level of the school heads' management capabilities in terms of financial and resource management obtained a weighted mean of 6.72 with a standard deviation of 0.35, which is verbally interpreted as Very High. It indicates that school heads effectively implement fiscal controls and auditing techniques to handle their budgetary responsibilities. The level of financial management implies that their ability to allocate resources, utilize organizational tools for tracking, and liquidate funds significantly contributes to transparency.

In summary, their commitment to fiscal accountability and self-correction enhances their capability to support school programs without financial delays. These strategies allow

them to maintain operational productivity while balancing professional duties and the equitable distribution of resources for all stakeholders.

The respondents in table 2, indicated that school heads consistently demonstrate very high management capabilities in terms of Human Resource Systems Management across all assessed indicators. Coordinating with DepEd for the timely processing of staff benefits obtained the highest mean score (Mean = 6.59, SD = 0.66) further demonstrates administrative efficiency in personnel-related matters. Implementing a fair and data-driven performance appraisal system was also highly observed, indicating that evaluation processes are generally systematic and objective. Additionally, encouraging staff participation in high-level professional training which shows the commitment of school heads to continuous professional growth. Facilitating coaching and mentoring sessions for struggling teachers and promoting a work-life balance environment for the faculty obtained lowest mean score (Mean = 6.41, SD = 0.78) but likewise rated always, reflecting sustained support for teacher development and well-being.

Table 2. Level of the School Heads' Management Capabilities in terms of Human Resource Systems Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...implements a fair and data-driven performance appraisal system.	6.53	0.67	Always
...facilitates coaching and mentoring sessions for struggling teachers.	6.45	0.68	Always
...promotes a work-life balance environment for the faculty.	6.41	0.78	Always
...coordinates with DepEd for the timely processing of staff benefits.	6.59	0.66	Always
...encourages staff participation in high-level professional training.	6.51	0.69	Always
Weighted Mean	6.50		
SD	0.50		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Overall, Human Resource Systems Management obtained a weighted mean of 6.60 with a standard deviation of 0.50, which is verbally interpreted as Very High. This implies that school heads effectively implement personnel development strategies to handle their staff responsibilities.

The level of HR management implies that their ability to monitor teachers' performance, prioritize staff welfare, and reward excellence significantly contributes to teacher motivation. Their commitment to continuous improvement of the teaching force enhances their capability to maintain a high performing institution while balancing professional duties and the personal well-being of the faculty.

Table 3 shows that the respondents observed that school heads consistently demonstrate very high management capabilities in terms of Data-Based Planning and Monitoring across all assessed indicators. Regularly monitoring progress toward the school's Key Performance Indicators obtained the highest mean (Mean = 6.72, SD = 0.45) which explains their focus on goal attainment and performance accountability. Additionally, they acknowledged that the school head uses the School Report Card (SRC) to update the community

demonstrates commitment to transparency and stakeholder engagement. They also observed that their school heads' are basing the administrative decisions on verified evidence rather than intuition underscores which shows rational and evidence-driven approach to leadership. However, their level of observation on how their school head maintain an organized and updated School Information System (Mean = 6.67, SD = 0.47) was lower as well as analyzing learner performance data to design intervention programs (Mean = 6.63, SD = 0.56) but still rated always.

Table 3. Level of the School Heads' Management Capabilities in terms of Data-Based Planning and Monitoring

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...analyses learner performance data to design intervention programs.	6.63	0.56	Always
...uses the School Report Card (SRC) to update the community.	6.70	0.52	Always
...regularly monitors progress toward the school's Key Performance Indicators.	6.72	0.45	Always
...maintains an organized and updated School Information System (LIS/BEIS).	6.67	0.47	Always
...bases administrative decisions on verified evidence rather than intuition.	6.70	0.46	Always
Weighted Mean		6.68	
SD		0.33	
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Collectively, Data-Based Planning and Monitoring obtained a weighted mean of 6.68 with a standard deviation of 0.33, which is verbally interpreted as Very High. Indicating that the school heads effectively utilize objective evidence to handle their planning responsibilities. Data utilization implies that their ability to prioritize facts over guesswork, adjust schedules based on trends, and utilize organizational monitoring tools significantly contributes to evidence-based management.

Based on the results, their commitment to data accuracy enhances their capability to make informed decisions for school improvement while maintaining operational efficiency.

Table 4. Level of the School Heads' Management Capabilities in terms of Partnership and Resource Mobilization

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...creates a structured plan for seeking external school stakeholders.	6.78	0.47	Always
...ensures all partnerships are covered by formal memoranda of agreement.	6.75	0.52	Always
...hosts appreciation events for school donors and partners.	6.83	0.40	Always
...effectively utilizes community manpower for school maintenance (Brigada Eskwela).	6.78	0.41	Always
...maximizes the involvement of the School Governing Council (SGC).	6.79	0.41	Always
Weighted Mean		6.78	
SD		0.28	
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 4 presents the results of school heads' management capabilities in terms of Partnership and Resource Mobilization across all assessed indicators as reflected in the highest mean score which school heads hosts appreciation events for school donors and partners (Mean = 6.83, SD = 0.40) showing the

recognition and maintenance of strong stakeholder relations. They also observed that their school leaders maximize the involvement of the School Governing Council (SGC). Additionally, they observed that school heads effectively utilizing community manpower for school maintenance, such as Brigada Eskwela, and creates structured plan for seeking external school stakeholders. Ensuring that all partnerships are covered by formal memoranda of agreement obtained lowest mean score (Mean = 6.75, SD = 0.52) but still demonstrates the school head's commitment to accountability and clear agreements.

Partnership and Resource Mobilization obtained a weighted mean of 6.78 with a standard deviation of 0.28, which is verbally interpreted as Very High. This implies that school heads effectively implement external networking and mobilization strategies to handle their resource gathering. The level of mobilization reflects that their ability to inspire community donors and utilize organizational networking tools significantly contributes to the school's financial sustainability.

In conclusion, their commitment to resource generation enhances their capability to implement projects beyond the basic government budget, contributing to effective leadership.

In table 5, respondents always observed that school heads consistently demonstrate very high management capabilities in terms of Stakeholder Governance Mechanisms across all assessed indicators. The findings reveal that both promoting participatory governance by ensuring that various stakeholders are meaningfully involved in school decision-making processes. For instance, conducting regular consultative meetings with parent-leaders and promoting shared accountability for the school's academic success obtained the highest mean scores (Mean = 6.85, SD = 0.37) stating that the school heads' efforts to foster a culture of collaboration and collective responsibility among teachers, parents, and community partners in achieving the school's educational goals. In addition, the respondents believe that their school heads' establishes clear feedback mechanism for community complaints ensures transparency, responsiveness, and accessibility in addressing stakeholder concerns. Involving stakeholders in the creation of school safety policies was rated lowest (Mean = 6.77, SD = 0.47) hence, always observed by the respondents.

Table 5. Level of the School Heads' Management Capabilities in terms of Stakeholder Governance Mechanisms

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...involves stakeholders in the creation of school safety policies.	6.77	0.47	Always
...conducts regular consultative meetings with parent-leaders.	6.85	0.37	Always
...promotes shared accountability for the school's academic success.	6.85	0.37	Always
...sets clear feedback mechanism for community complaints.	6.82	0.38	Always
...ensures stakeholders are part of the school's monitoring and evaluation team.	6.79	0.43	Always
Weighted Mean	6.82		
SD	0.27		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

To conclude, the level of management capabilities in this area was rated very high by the respondents, with a weighted mean of 6.82 (SD = 0.27), indicating that school heads consistently practice inclusive and participatory governance. The relatively low standard deviation further suggests that the respondents' perceptions are highly consistent, reflecting a common recognition of the school heads' strong leadership practices in engaging stakeholders in governance processes.

Above all, the findings show that school heads actively engage stakeholders to promote transparency, accountability, and collaborative decision-making in school operations. Such practices help strengthen trust between the school and the community, encourage collective participation in school initiatives, and enhance the effectiveness of school governance mechanisms.

In Table 6, respondents always observed that school heads consistently demonstrate very high management capabilities in terms of Instructional Systems Management across all assessed indicators. This was evident in the highest mean score (Mean = 6.74, SD = 0.51) which is conducting regular classroom observations. Additionally, they have always observed that school heads regularly monitor the effective use of learning materials and modules. Leading the development of localized or contextualized curriculum materials and overseeing the implementation of remedial and enrichment classes, and evaluating the impact of instructional programs on student literacy and numeracy also obtained high mean scores which proves that their school heads demonstrate very high management capabilities in terms of Instructional Systems Management. Oversees the implementation of remedial and enrichment classes (Mean = 6.63, SD = 0.57) obtained the lowest mean score and was still always observed by the respondents.

Table 6. Level of the School Heads' Management Capabilities in terms of Instructional Systems Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...conducts regular classroom observations to provide technical assistance.	6.74	0.51	Always
...monitors the effective use of learning materials and modules.	6.69	0.48	Always
...leads the development of localized or contextualized curriculum materials.	6.67	0.59	Always
...oversees the implementation of remedial and enrichment classes.	6.63	0.57	Always
...evaluates the impact of instructional programs on student literacy/numeracy.	6.69	0.54	Always
Weighted Mean	6.68		
SD	0.38		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The management capabilities in this area was rated very high by the respondents, with a weighted mean of 6.68 (SD = 0.38), indicating that school heads actively guide, monitor, and enhance instructional processes to ensure quality learning outcomes. These practices reflect a structured and evidence-based approach to curriculum implementation, teacher support, and student performance evaluation.

Overall, the results indicates that school heads consistently integrate instructional oversight with management practices to foster high-quality education in their schools.

Level of School Heads' Competencies

In this study, the level of School Heads' competencies refers to Strategic and Visionary Thinking, Emotional Intelligence, Ethical Professionalism, Innovation and Improvement, Communication Skills and Community Relationship Building Orientation.

The respondents in table 7, always observed that school heads very often demonstrate leadership competencies across all measured dimensions. This was evident in the highest mean score (Mean=6.69, SD=0.53), which indicates that school heads excel most at aligning school initiatives with the national educational vision, demonstrating a strong capacity for macro-level systemic integration. While all other indicators likewise received "Always" remarks, the collaborative review of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) showed the greatest consistency among respondents, followed by the communication of core values and the establishment of long-term strategic roadmaps. Even the lowest scoring indicator, proactive problem-solving (Mean=6.47, SD = 0.77), remains within the highest qualitative interpretation, stating that school heads are exceptionally effective at maintaining the Structural Subsystem required for successful School-Based Management implementation.

Table 7. Level of the School Heads' Competencies in terms of Strategic and Visionary Thinking

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...sets clear long-term goals and a strategic roadmap for the school.	6.56	0.60	Always
...anticipates potential challenges and develops proactive solutions.	6.47	0.77	Always
...aligns all school initiatives with the national educational vision.	6.69	0.53	Always
...communicates the school's core values to all internal stakeholders.	6.63	0.68	Always
...leads the collaborative review of the School Improvement Plan (SIP).	6.65	0.50	Always
Weighted Mean	6.60		
SD	0.39		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Moreover, the level of school heads' competencies in terms of strategic and visionary thinking obtained a weighted mean of 6.60 with a standard deviation of 0.39, which is verbally interpreted as Very High. This shows that school heads effectively implement various visionary strategies to handle their institutional responsibilities.

Ultimately, their commitment to setting clear directions and continuous improvement enhances their capability to manage institutional demands. These strategies allow them to maintain productivity while balancing professional duties and the long-term growth of the institution, ultimately contributing to effective leadership that helps the school community to grow.

Given these points, Emotional Intelligence achieved a very high rating obtained a weighted mean of 6.64 with a standard

deviation of 0.47. This shows that school heads effectively utilize self-awareness and empathy to handle their interpersonal responsibilities. This implies that their ability to remain calm under pressure, understand staff needs, and adjust their social responses significantly contributes to a harmonious environment. In summary, their commitment to emotional regulation and self-reflection enhances their capability to manage diverse personalities within the school. These strategies allow them to maintain a positive climate while balancing professional duties and the personal well-being of every individual within the academic institution, ultimately contributing to a supportive leadership style.

Table 8. Level of the School Heads' Competencies in terms of Emotional Intelligence

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...demonstrates genuine understanding of teachers' professional needs.	6.60	0.66	Always
...manages interpersonal conflicts with fairness and diplomacy.	6.65	0.52	Always
...maintains a calm and composed demeanour during school crises.	6.67	0.60	Always
...displays high levels of empathy when dealing with staff concerns.	6.58	0.66	Always
...motivates the team by recognizing their individual strengths.	6.65	0.63	Always
Weighted Mean	6.64		
SD	0.47		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 9 reveals that respondents consistently observed very high levels of Ethical Professionalism among school heads across all indicators. Notably, serving as a role model for professional conduct and punctuality received the highest mean score (Mean = 6.74, SD = 0.45), indicating that school heads strongly exemplify professionalism in both behavior and attitude. This is followed by making principled decisions that prioritize the welfare of learners and promoting a culture of accountability and ethics among staff, which further emphasize their commitment to ethical leadership. Maintaining integrity in financial and administrative actions was also highly evident, while implementing school policies without favoritism ranked lowest (Mean = 6.53, SD = 0.92) among the indicators, though still interpreted as consistently practiced.

Table 9. Level of the School Heads' Competencies in terms of Ethical Professionalism

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...makes principled decisions that prioritize the welfare of learners.	6.72	0.47	Always
...maintains unwavering integrity in all financial and administrative actions.	6.64	0.58	Always
...promotes a culture of accountability and ethics among the staff.	6.68	0.60	Always
...serves as a role model for professional conduct and punctuality.	6.74	0.45	Always
...ensures that school policies are implemented without favouritism.	6.53	0.92	Always
Weighted Mean	6.66		
SD	0.44		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Given these points, Ethical Professionalism obtained a weighted mean of 6.66 with a standard deviation of 0.48, which is verbally interpreted as Always. The results proved that school heads effectively implement ethical standards and integrity to handle their professional duties. In essence, their commitment to ethical practices, including transparent management of financial resources and principled decision-making, strengthens institutional trust and fosters a culture of integrity within the school community.

Table 10. Level of the School Heads' Competencies in terms of Innovation and Improvement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...encourages teachers to adopt modern and creative teaching ideas.	6.64	0.56	Always
...provides resources to support experimental learning projects.	6.58	0.56	Always
...actively seeks feedback to improve existing school processes.	6.57	0.70	Always
...identifies new opportunities for school growth and advancement.	6.69	0.67	Always
...leads the implementation of continuous improvement projects.	6.75	0.47	Always
Weighted Mean	6.65		
SD	0.41		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 10 highlights that respondents consistently observed very high competencies in Innovation and Improvement among school heads across all indicators. Leading the implementation of continuous improvement projects ranked highest (Mean = 6.75, SD = 0.47), followed by identifying new opportunities for school growth and advancement and encouraging teachers to adopt modern and creative teaching ideas, which reflect their proactive approach to development. Providing resources to support experimental learning projects and actively seeking feedback to improve existing school processes ranked lower (Mean = 6.57, SD = 0.70), though still consistently practiced among school heads.

The result signifies, Innovation and Improvement obtained a weighted mean of 6.65 with a standard deviation of 0.43, which is verbally interpreted as Always. This indicates that school heads effectively implement creative solutions to handle school-wide improvements. Innovation implies that their ability to introduce change and utilize new tools significantly contributes to school modernization. Their commitment to continuous improvement and self-reflection enhances their capability to navigate changing educational demands.

Table 11 presents that respondents consistently observed very high competencies in Communication Skills among school heads across all indicators. Ranked among, the highest was ensuring that information regarding DepEd orders is timely shared (Mean = 6.70, SD = 0.58). This is followed by using various digital and physical platforms to keep stakeholders informed and clearly articulating the school's goals and performance targets. Facilitating open and honest dialogues during faculty meetings further reflects their commitment to transparency and collaboration. Meanwhile, actively listening to and valuing staff suggestions ranked

lowest among the indicators (Mean = 6.56, SD = 0.73), but it remains consistently practiced.

Table 11. Level of the School Heads' Competencies in terms of Communication Skills

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...clearly articulates the school's goals and performance targets.	6.68	0.47	Always
...listens actively and gives value to the suggestions of the staff.	6.56	0.73	Always
...ensures that information regarding DepEd orders is timely shared.	6.70	0.58	Always
...facilitates open and honest dialogues during faculty meetings.	6.66	0.52	Always
...uses various platforms (digital/physical) to keep stakeholders informed.	6.69	0.57	Always
Weighted Mean	6.66		
SD	0.40		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The data implies that Communication Skills obtained a weighted mean of 6.66 with a standard deviation of 0.48, which is verbally interpreted as Very High. Therefore, school heads always implement open communication channels to handle their administrative responsibilities. It also implies that their ability to provide clear feedback and utilize organizational dialogue tools significantly contributes to operational efficiency.

Table 12. Level of the School Heads' Competencies in terms of Community Relationship-Building

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school head...			
...sustains strong and active partnerships with the PTA.	6.81	0.39	Always
...collaborates with local government units for school support.	6.84	0.37	Always
...invites community leaders to participate in school planning.	6.79	0.41	Always
...promotes the school as a center for community development.	6.85	0.36	Always
...actively engages alumni in school improvement initiatives.	6.66	0.53	Always
Weighted Mean	6.79		
SD	0.25		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 12 illustrates that respondents consistently observed very high competencies in Community Relationship-Building among school heads across all assessed indicators. Highest mean score (Mean = 6.85, SD = 0.36) was promoting the school as a center for community development saying that school heads strongly position the school as an active contributor to community growth. Closely followed by collaboration with local government units for school support and sustaining strong and active partnerships with the PTA. Inviting community leaders to participate in school planning further demonstrates inclusive governance practices. Meanwhile, actively engaging alumni in school improvement initiatives, although slightly lower than the other indicators (Mean = 6.66, SD = 0.53), remains within the very high category.

Altogether, Community Relationship-Building obtained a weighted mean of 6.79 with a standard deviation of 0.25,

which is verbally interpreted as Very High. It proves that school heads effectively implement networking strategies to handle their community-related responsibilities and implies that their ability to build partnerships and prioritize stakeholders needs significant contributions to the school's resource sustainability.

Level of Implementation of the Revised SBM Dimensions

In this study, the level of implementation of the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) dimensions refers to how effectively the schools apply the prescribed practices in curriculum and teaching, learning environment, leadership, governance and accountability, human resource and team development, and finance and resource management and mobilization.

The following tables present the statements, corresponding mean scores, standard deviations, remarks, and verbal interpretations based on the responses of the participants, reflecting the level to which each SBM dimension is implemented in the schools.

Table 13. Level of Implementation of the Revised SBM Dimensions in terms of Curriculum and Teaching

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The implementation of the revised SBM dimension ensures that...			
...the curriculum is regularly updated to meet 21st-century skills.	6.69	0.56	Always
...teaching methods are adjusted to suit diverse types of learners.	6.72	0.51	Always
...teachers use various assessment tools to track student progress.	6.72	0.46	Always
...ICT is effectively integrated into daily classroom instruction.	6.69	0.52	Always
...learning resources are sufficient for the number of enrolled students.	6.37	1.03	Always
Weighted Mean	6.64		
SD	0.45		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

In table 13, the results highlights that respondents consistently observed a very high level of implementation of the revised School-Based Management (SBM) dimensions in terms of Curriculum and Teaching across all assessed indicators. Results show that adjusting teaching methods to suit diverse types of learners and ensuring that teachers use various assessment tools to track student progress ranked highest (Mean = 6.72, SD = 0.51), , indicating responsiveness to varied learning needs and the use of evidence-based strategies to monitor outcomes. This is followed by ensuring that the curriculum is regularly updated to meet 21st-century skills, which reflects a proactive approach to maintaining instructional relevance and alignment with modern educational standards. ICT is effectively integrated into daily classroom instruction received lowest mean score (Mean = 6.69, SD = 0.56) though maintained to be always observed by the respondents.

The implementation of the revised SBM dimensions in Curriculum and Teaching was rated very high by respondents, with a weighted mean of 6.64 (SD = 0.45). By consistently updating curricula, adapting teaching methods, and utilizing

various assessment tools, school leaders ensure that teaching practices remain effective and responsive to learners' needs.

Table 14. Level of Implementation of the Revised SBM Dimensions in terms of Learning Environment

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The implementation of the revised SBM dimension ensures that...			
...the school provides a physically safe and secure campus.	6.47	0.72	Always
...classrooms are well-ventilated and conducive to learning.	6.37	0.76	Always
...the school promotes a "no bullying" and child-protected environment.	6.70	0.54	Always
...sanitation and health facilities are clean and accessible.	6.37	0.90	Always
...the school climate fosters psychological safety for all students.	6.53	0.74	Always
Weighted Mean	6.49		
SD	0.50		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Table 14 clearly shows respondents indicated that the implementation of the revised SBM (School-Based Management) dimensions in terms of Learning Environment is consistently very high across all assessed indicators. The implementation ensures that the school promotes a “no bullying” and child-protected environment with the highest mean score (Mean = 6.70, SD = 0.54), demonstrating proactive efforts to safeguard students' rights and wellbeing. It also ensures that the school climate fosters psychological safety for all students, supporting emotional wellbeing and a positive learning atmosphere.

Furthermore, the implementation ensures that the school provides a physically safe and secure campus, reflecting a commitment to student protection and safety. It also ensures that the implementation ensures that sanitation and health facilities are clean and accessible, indicating attention to the health and hygiene needs of the school community. Lastly, classrooms are well-ventilated and conducive to learning (Mean = 6.37, SD = 0.76), showing that attention to creating an environment that supports comfort and effective instruction.

In conclusion, the level of implementation of the revised SBM dimensions in Learning Environment was rated very high by respondents, with a weighted mean of 6.49 (SD = 0.50). This means that school leaders actively ensure a safe, healthy, and supportive environment conducive to both learning and student wellbeing.

In summary, the findings indicate that the revised SBM framework promotes structured and evidence-based approaches to managing the learning environment. By providing safety and security, maintaining clean and accessible facilities, promoting anti-bullying policies, and fostering psychological safety, school leaders create a holistic environment that supports students' physical, emotional, and academic development.

Data presented in Table 16 reveal that the implementation of the revised SBM (School-Based Management) dimensions in terms of Leadership is consistently very high across the assessed indicators. This was evident in the highest mean

score (Mean = 6.65, SD = 0.48), which demonstrates that leaders are consistently visible and accessible to students and parents, fostering a transparent and approachable administrative environment. High levels of performance are also observed in the school head's ability to provide clear direction for school development and the consistent focus of leadership decisions on learner welfare. Furthermore, the implementation effectively encourages collective ownership of school goals and empowers teachers to take on leadership roles, although slightly lower than the other indicators (Mean = 6.58, SD = 0.58) remains within the very high category.

Table 15. Level of Implementation of the Revised SBM Dimensions in terms of Leadership

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The implementation of the revised SBM dimension ensures that...			
...school leadership empowers teachers to take on leadership roles.	6.58	0.58	Always
...leaders are visible and accessible to students and parents.	6.65	0.48	Always
...leadership decisions are consistently focused on learner welfare	6.63	0.48	Always
...the school head provides a clear direction for school development..	6.64	0.55	Always
...leadership style encourages collective ownership of school goals.	6.59	0.54	Always
Weighted Mean	6.61		
SD	0.38		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Collectively, the level of implementation of the revised SBM dimensions in Leadership was rated very high by respondents, with a weighted mean of 6.61 (SD = 0.38). With the results gathered this indicate that the revised SBM framework supports structured and evidence-based leadership practices. By empowering teachers through providing their needs, trainings that could help them be empowered and prioritizing learner welfare, school leaders create an environment that promotes collaboration, accountability, and student-focused outcomes.

Table 16. Level of Implementation of the Revised SBM Dimensions in terms of Governance and Accountability

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The implementation of the revised SBM dimension ensures that...			
...the school has an active and functional School Governing Council.	6.73	0.45	Always
...school financial reports are posted in the Transparency Board.	6.65	0.55	Always
...roles and responsibilities of staff are clearly defined and documented.	6.68	0.47	Always
...regular SBM self-assessment is conducted by the school team.	6.66	0.57	Always
...stakeholders are involved in evaluating the school's performance.	6.61	0.62	Always
Weighted Mean	6.67		
SD	0.35		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

The results in table 16 illustrates the implementation of the revised SBM (School-Based Management) dimensions in terms of Governance and Accountability remains consistently very high across all indicators. Foremost, the school maintains

an active and functional School Governing Council (Mean= 6.73, SD = 0.45), underscoring strong oversight and participatory decision-making. This is followed by the clear definition and documentation of staff roles and responsibilities, which reflects effective organizational structure and accountability in task delegation. Also, the regular posting of financial reports on the Transparency Board demonstrates the school's commitment to openness and responsible financial management. Lastly, stakeholders are involved in evaluating the school's performance received the lowest mean score (Mean= 6.61, SD = 0.62).

The level of implementation of the revised SBM dimensions in Governance and Accountability was rated very high by respondents, with a weighted mean of 6.67 (SD = 0.35). Using the results as evidence that the revised SBM framework fosters structured, participatory, and evidence-based governance practices.

Table 17. Level of Implementation of the Revised SBM Dimensions in terms of Human Resource and Team Development

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The implementation of the revised SBM dimension ensures that...			
...teachers are given equal opportunities for regional/national training.	6.57	0.63	Always
...learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions are regularly conducted.	6.76	0.49	Always
...new teachers are provided with effective induction and orientation.	6.56	0.59	Always
...the school supports the advanced graduate studies of its staff.	6.51	0.75	Always
...team-building activities are held to strengthen professional bonds.	6.54	0.68	Always
Weighted Mean	6.59		
SD	0.42		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Based on the data provided in table 17, the implementation of the revised SBM dimensions in terms of Human Resource and Team Development follows a clear hierarchy of priority. Leading the indicators is the regular conduct of Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions (Mean = 6.76, SD = 0.49), which demonstrates a primary focus on active engagement in collaborative learning and continuous professional development. This is followed by the provision of equal opportunities for teachers to attend regional and national training, reflecting a strong commitment to professional growth and equitable development. Though obtained the lowest mean, respondents always observed that school heads also ensures that the school supports the advanced graduate studies of its staff (Mean = 6.51, SD = 0.75), indicating encouragement of further academic and professional advancement.

The respondents rated the implementation of the revised SBM dimensions in Human Resource and Team Development as very high, evidenced by a weighted mean of 6.59. This indicates that school leadership is deeply committed to fostering professional advancement, teamwork, and organizational unity. By prioritizing these areas, the school effectively strengthens staff capabilities and cultivates a

collaborative environment aimed at boosting overall instructional quality and institutional performance.

Table 18. Level of Implementation of the Revised SBM Dimensions in terms of Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The implementation of the revised SBM dimension ensures that...			
resource allocation is strictly based on the Annual Implementation Plan.	6.72	0.45	Always
the school conducts regular inventories of books and learning materials.	6.51	0.76	Always
funds are successfully generated through local community partnerships.	6.64	0.60	Always
procurement processes follow legal and ethical standards.	6.66	0.58	Always
financial records are updated and ready for audit at any time.	6.66	0.58	Always
Weighted Mean	6.64		
SD	0.44		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

In Table 18, respondents indicated that the implementation of the revised SBM (School-Based Management) dimensions in terms of Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization is consistently very high across all assessed indicators. The implementation ensures that resource allocation is strictly based on the Annual Implementation Plan (Mean = 6.72, SD = 0.45), reflecting systematic and strategic financial planning aligned with school priorities. Moreover, the implementation ensures that funds are successfully generated through local community partnerships. It also ensures that procurement processes follow legal and ethical standards. Additionally, the implementation ensures that financial records are updated and ready for audit at any time, reflecting strong financial management and preparedness for accountability reviews. Although obtained the lowest mean score (Mean = 6.51, SD = 0.76), respondents always observed that SBM implementation always ensures that the school conducts regular inventories of books and learning materials, demonstrating accountability and proper monitoring of educational resources.

Overall, the level of implementation of the revised SBM dimensions in Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization was rated very high by respondents, with a weighted mean of 6.64 (SD = 0.44), indicating that school leaders effectively manage financial resources through strategic allocation, transparent procurement, consistent inventory practices, community partnership engagement, and proper documentation.

In conclusion, the revised SBM framework promotes structured, transparent, and accountable financial management practices. By aligning resource allocation with planned priorities, conducting regular inventories, mobilizing community support, adhering to legal procurement standards, and maintaining updated financial records, school leaders ensure efficient and ethical use of school resources.

Overall, the findings highlight that sound financial and resource management is a critical component of effective SBM implementation.

Test of Relationship between School Heads’ Management Capabilities and the Implementation of The Revised SBM Dimensions

To determine whether a significant relationship exists between school heads’ competencies such as strategic and visionary thinking, emotional intelligence, ethical professionalism, innovation and improvement, communication skills, and community relationship-building and the implementation of the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) dimensions, the variables were statistically analyzed using appropriate data analysis tools.

Table 19 indicates that all computed Pearson correlation coefficients show statistically significant relationships at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$), suggesting that the associations observed between school heads’ competencies and SBM dimensions are highly significant. This means that the likelihood of these relationships occurring by chance is very low, thereby providing strong evidence of a meaningful connection between the variables. Furthermore, the consistently significant results across all dimensions imply that school heads’ competencies are systematically linked to the effective implementation of SBM practices.

This implies that higher levels of leadership competencies are associated with better implementation of SBM dimensions, thereby confirming that school heads’ capabilities play a crucial role in strengthening various aspects of school management and organizational effectiveness. Specifically, school heads who demonstrate strong strategic thinking, emotional intelligence, and ethical professionalism are more likely to influence effective curriculum delivery, foster a positive learning environment, and promote accountable governance practices. Moreover, their competencies in innovation, communication, and community relationship-building contribute to improved collaboration among stakeholders, efficient utilization of resources, and sustained school improvement initiatives.

Overall, the results confirm that school heads’ competencies function as an interconnected system that supports all SBM dimensions simultaneously. This reinforces the concept that successful SBM implementation depends on strong leadership capacity, collaborative governance, evidence-based planning, and effective resource management.

Test of Relationship between School Heads’ Competencies and the Implementation of The Revised SBM Dimensions

To determine whether a significant relationship exists between school heads’ competencies specifically strategic and visionary thinking, emotional intelligence, ethical professionalism, innovation and improvement, communication skills, and community relationship building and the implementation of the Revised School Based Management (SBM) dimensions, the variables were statistically analyzed using appropriate data analysis tools. This analysis aimed to identify the level to which the competencies demonstrated by school heads are associated with the effectiveness of SBM implementation in different operational areas of the school.

Additionally, it provides empirical evidence on how leadership competencies may influence the successful

application of SBM principles in promoting improved school management, stakeholder participation, and overall institutional development.

Table 19. Relationship between School Heads' Management Capabilities and the Implementation of the Revised SBM Dimensions

School Heads' Management Capabilities		Implementation of The Revised SBM Dimensions					
		C&T	LE	L	GA	H R T D	F R M & M
Financial and Resource Management	Pearson Correlation	0.695**	0.677**	0.751**	0.749**	0.793**	0.833**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Human Resource Systems Management	Pearson Correlation	0.890**	0.793**	0.840**	0.711**	0.832**	0.834**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Data-Based Planning & Monitoring	Pearson Correlation	0.889**	0.750**	0.795**	0.777**	0.780**	0.832**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Partnership and Resource Mobilization	Pearson Correlation	0.753**	0.800**	0.792**	0.646**	0.797**	0.797**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Stakeholder Governance Mechanism	Pearson Correlation	0.717**	0.887**	0.869**	0.635**	0.817**	0.855**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Instructional Systems Management	Pearson Correlation	0.587**	0.765**	0.698**	0.567**	0.650**	0.721**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257

Table 20. Relationship between School Heads' Competencies and the Implementation of the Revised SBM Dimensions

School Heads' Competencies		Implementation of The Revised SBM Dimensions					
		C&T	LE	L	GA	H R T D	F R M & M
Strategic and Visionary Thinking	Pearson Correlation	0.753**	0.761**	0.658**	0.536**	0.568**	0.470**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Emotional Intelligence	Pearson Correlation	0.794**	0.881**	0.447**	0.317**	0.260**	0.468**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Ethical Professionalism	Pearson Correlation	0.844**	0.839**	0.396**	0.323**	0.354**	0.338**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Innovation and Improvement	Pearson Correlation	0.846**	0.843**	0.648**	0.459**	0.581**	0.628**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Communication skills	Pearson Correlation	0.859**	0.873**	0.829**	0.507**	0.600**	0.779**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257
Community Relationship-Building	Pearson Correlation	0.715**	0.645**	0.770**	0.562**	0.542**	0.776**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	N	257	257	257	257	257	257

Table 20 indicates that all computed Pearson correlation coefficients show statistically significant relationships at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$). The consistently significant results across all competencies and SBM dimensions indicate that school heads' leadership competencies are systematically linked to the effective implementation of school-based management practices.

This implies that higher levels of school heads' competencies are associated with better implementation of

SBM dimensions, thereby confirming that leadership capability plays a crucial role in strengthening various aspects of school management and organizational effectiveness. Specifically, school heads who demonstrate strong strategic and visionary thinking are more likely to influence effective curriculum delivery, strengthen instructional planning, and support a well-organized learning environment. Likewise, emotional intelligence contributes to maintaining positive school climate and improving interpersonal relationships

within the school community, while ethical professionalism reinforces accountability and integrity in governance practices.

Moreover, competencies in innovation and improvement enhance the ability of school heads to introduce effective reforms and continuous improvement initiatives that support school development. Communication skills, on the other hand, facilitate clearer coordination, stronger leadership direction, and improved implementation of school policies and programs. In addition, community relationship-building strengthens stakeholder engagement, which contributes to improved resource mobilization, enhanced leadership support, and better financial and operational sustainability of schools.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The management capabilities of school heads, including financial and resource management, human resource systems management, data-based planning and monitoring, partnership and resource mobilization, stakeholder governance mechanisms, and instructional systems management, also demonstrate a significant relationship with the implementation of the Revised SBM dimensions. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between school heads' management capabilities and implementation of the Revised School-Based Management is rejected. This concludes that strong managerial capacity contributes significantly to the effective operation, sustainability, and accountability of school-based management systems.

The competencies of school heads, particularly in terms of strategic and visionary thinking, emotional intelligence, ethical professionalism, innovation and improvement, communication skills, and community relationship-building orientation, have a significant relationship with the implementation of the Revised School-Based Management dimensions. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between school heads' competencies and the implementation of the revised School-Based Management is rejected. This indicates that the attributes and capabilities of the school heads play a vital role in strengthening governance systems, improving collaboration among stakeholders, and ensuring the effective implementation of SBM practices.

In view of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed.

The Department of Education and school administrators may design and implement structured leadership development programs aimed at strengthening the management capabilities of school heads, particularly in the areas of financial management, data-driven decision-making, human resource management, and instructional leadership.

Schools may further strengthen stakeholder participation by fostering collaborative partnerships with parents, community members, local government units, and other external partners to support the effective implementation and sustainability of School-Based Management practices. They may adopt and utilize the proposed SBM Implementation Improvement Plan as a strategic guide to improve leadership competencies, enhance management capabilities, and sustain the effective implementation of SBM dimensions.

School heads may continue to enhance their leadership competencies through continuous professional development programs, leadership training seminars, and capacity-building initiatives that focus on strategic planning, emotional intelligence, innovation, and effective communication in school leadership.

Future researchers may conduct related studies that explore other variables influencing the effectiveness of School-Based Management, such as leadership styles, organizational culture, teacher motivation, and school climate, to provide a broader understanding of the factors that contribute to effective school governance and management.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Department of Education. (2024). DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the revised school-based management (SBM) system. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/DO_s2024_007.pdf
- [2]. Pascua, J. A. (2024). Implementation of school-based management in private secondary schools of Abulug District: Basis for an enhancement plan. *ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(3). <https://isrgpublishers.com/wpcontent/uploads/2024/06/ISRGJAHSS5082024.pdf>
- [3]. UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms? UNESCO.