PRACTICES OF THE STAKEHOLDERS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE FORMULATION OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Maricar Flores Nicdao and Inero Valbuena Ancho[*]

College of Graduate Studies and Teacher Education Research, Philippine Normal University, Manila 1000, Philippines

[*]Corresponding author: ancho.iv@pnu.edu.ph

Abstract

The Philippine Department of Education promotes shared governance through School Based Management (SBM) as stated in the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. The school heads are required to develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP) that requires the involvement of stakeholders. This study aimed to identify the extent of stakeholders' knowledge about the School Improvement Plan; analyze the extent of the stakeholders' involvement in the formulation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan in terms of the Assess Phase, Plan Phase, and Act Phase; and describe the practices on stakeholders' involvement in the formulation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Instruments used to gather data were prepared by the researcher and had been validated by the experts in the field of SBM and SIP. Results were organized and analyzed to answer the research questions of the study. Data revealed that stakeholders generally agreed that they understand the School Improvement Plan as a process. The key stakeholders gave several definitions that were aligned and similar to the definition given by the Deparament of Education (DepED); though schools had some modifications. Moreover, different practices emerged in the study in the different phases of SIP. These practices were proven to have high and very high level of stakeholders' involvement. Key stakeholders were also asked about their unique practices that they thought made their school invite and involve more stakeholders particularly in the SIP process. It was observed that there are

good practices that are beneficial on a particular school; common practices, practices that are just part of the guidelines and distinct practices on specific schools. A high and a very high extent of participation were observed on the practices presented.

Introduction

According to the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, the Department of Education (DepEd) promotes shared governance through School Based Management (SBM). SBM is the government's strategy to decentralize education decision making by increasing parental and community involvement in schools (World Bank, 2008). Further, it enables active participation by empowering the key stakeholders in school communities for the continuous improvement of schools towards the attainment of students learning outcomes (DepEd, 2012).

One of the enabling policies formulated and supported under SBM is the creation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) by the school heads. The SIP is considered as the road map that lays down specific interventions the school undertakes within a period three of consecutive school years with the help of the community and other stakeholders (DepEd, 2015a). The involvement of the stakeholders in the formulation and implementation of SIP was highlighted and given importance from the Assess phase to Act phase. These phases complete the cycle of the Enhanced School Improvement Plan mandated by the department. Moreover, in School Based Management, the SIP serves as an agent of change. This serves a vehicle of improvement in SBM that caters total development and improvement of the school through shared responsibilities with the community it serves (Anchilo, 2012). The guiding principles of the mandate is the formulation and implementation of the SIP which involve the active participation of all educational stakeholders in the school and community such as the school heads, teachers, parents, community leaders and the learners themselves, among others.

During the Assess Phase, the first phase in the formulation of the plan, listening to the voice of the learners and stakeholders is highly encouraged. In the study of Lopez-Reyna, et al. (2012), part of the critical features of program improvement was the use of stakeholders' input and feedback. The study revealed that changes and reforms are best accomplished when the participants are responsible for determining both what they wanted to focus on and the pace at which they wish to progress. The school may have data, but they should be validated to determine the real

needs and problems of the learners and stakeholders. Validation may also serve as a good opportunity for the team member to discuss how they could help the school and how they feel about the programs and interventions provided by the school. Consequently, insights on how to improve the school processes could be gained and planned.

Studies confirm that involvement and participation of multiple stakeholders contribute to a better management of schools (Bruns, Filmer and Patrinos, 2011). Collaboration between the school and community members is encouraged to support the school improvement (Ice, et al., 2015). Moreover, in the study of Olguin and Keim (2009), the importance of the active participation of the students, parents, community, and administrators in the planning and execution of the different school processes are highlighted. Smith and Goodwin (2014) claimed that when stakeholders are active in creating the plan for improvement, there are greater possibilities to carry out the plan.

Furthermore, Tobergte and Curtis (2013) stated that accountability positively affects stakeholders' perceptions, expectations and discipline in the school environment. Theoretically, enhancing the bridging of stakeholders with the school foster trust and further increases the level of community involvement in school. In other words, community involvement in school may serve as a springboard in developing an additional form of community involvement in schools (Preston, 2013).

Though there are more factors affecting the formulation of School Improvement Plan, the researcher believes that the involvement of the stakeholders is one of the most important parts in the process. Hence, she finds it necessary to study the practices of stakeholders' involvement in the formulation of the School Improvement Plan among the high performing schools. In summary, the present study focused on the extent of stakeholders' knowledge and involvement in each phase of SIP and the manner by which schools involve their stakeholders in the conduct of different phases. It further includes the practices that each school uses and implements to involve their stakeholders in the cycle for them to be updated and involved with the different activities or programs that the school is providing particularly the School Improvement Plan.

Methodology

The research employed descriptive method; particularly the survey method research. In the survey method, respondents answered questions administered through interviews or questionnaires. After respondents answered the interview questions, the researcher described the responses given. In order for the survey to be both reliable and valid, questions were constructed and validated properly.

Construction and administration of more structured survey questionnaires based on the data collected and analyzed in the interviews were employed. Data were analyzed and used to determine the practices of stakeholders' involvement in the formulation and implementation of School Improvement Plan.

Results and Discussion

A. Extent of Stakeholders' Knowledge on School Improvement Plan

1. General Concepts on School Improvement Plan

Based on the data collected during the interviews, the general description by the participants on School Improvement Plan is that it's a plan that includes programs, projects, and interventions that the school undertakes with the help of the community and other stakeholders within three consecutive school years. A principal cited the shared effort and governance of key stakeholders in the process which was further confirmed by her teachers; SIP is a three-year plan crafted to address the needs of the learners and to meet the standards of DepED. The needs or issues being faced by the school in terms of achieving quality education are based on the results of the assessments or available data in every branch of SIP like literacy and numeracy. These crafted projects are all anchored in the DepED's vision and mission. The personnel and stakeholders are also actively engaged and share responsibility for developing life-long learners.

Moreover, the need of setting priorities and needs of the school were highlighted by another school; this plan is based on the priorities and need improvements of the school. This is a detailed plan wherein the programs,

223

projects and activities for the school year are planned and organized for the attainment of the mission and vision of the department. The basis for these programs and projects are the existing problems, which were identified in the gap analysis. The objectives, time frame, budget, persons involved, activities which will be undertaken and the possible outcomes were also written.

It was supported by most of the principals that stakeholders should be part of the School Improvement Plan. It was validated and confirmed by the teachers and parents who are part of the study. It was confirmed that these key stakeholders were invited during the formulation and implementation of the SIP. Meetings and task orientation were observed on some schools.

Answers from the key stakeholders were aligned and similar from the definition given by the Department of Education stated in DepEd Order No. 44 Series 2015 that School Improvement Plan is considered as the road map that lays down specific interventions that the school undertakes within the period of three of consecutive school years with the help of the community and other stakeholders. It was observed that there is a commonality on the answers they provide as all believe that the plan should include the projects, programs and intervention of the school for a specific number of school years; though years may vary. It was also observed that schools vary on the highlights of their plan depending on their set priorities. However, all these boil down to the main goal of education, which is the students' success, which was highlighted in some of the given answers from the key stakeholders. Considering that their definitions were aligned and similar with the department's, the participating key stakeholders were considered knowledgeable on the definition of the said plan.

2. School Planning Team

The most frequent responses of the participants of who were involved in their School Planning team include the internal and external stakeholders of the school specifically the school principal, barangay captain or Local Government Unit (LGU), faculty president or Teachers' Representative, Master Teachers and Teachers, Chair of Disciplining Committee or CCP Coordinator, grade chairman, program coordinator,

School Disaster Risk Reduction Management Committee (SDRRMC) representative, General Parent Teacher Association (GPTA) or Parents' Representative, Supreme Pupil/Student Government or Student's Representative, Alumni, private sectors, and religious group leader.

Based on the Enhanced School Improvement Guidelines from DepEd; School Planning Team (SPT) includes the School Head as the Team leader, student representative, teacher representative, parent representative, barangay representative, and members of school child protection committee. The answers from the participating schools go beyond the required members depending on the need of their school. It was observed that all schools involve the required members given by the department but some schools go beyond depending upon the needs of the project. It was also observed that the School Heads invited and tapped the stakeholders who are more knowledgeable on a certain issue and concern for the school. Teamwork and strong partnership was evident among the schools.

The guiding principles of School Improvement Plan (DepEd, 2015b), stated that the formulation and implementation of the SIP shall involve the active participation of all educational stakeholders in the school and community such as the school heads, teachers, parents, community leaders and the learners themselves, among others. From the responses of the participating school heads, the high level of stakeholders' involvement in their school could be concluded. Strong partnership and active involvement are evident in their respective schools. Result of the study attested the claim of Bruns et al. (2011) that involvement and participation of multiple stakeholders contribute to a better management of schools. Ice et al. (2015) also suggested that the school and community members brainstorm collaboratively regarding ways for them to work together to support school improvement.

To further prove the extent of stakeholders' knowledge on School Improvement Plan, Teachers who are members of the School Planning Team were asked to answer a more structured survey questionnaire. Data generally

revealed a general weighted mean of 4.04 verbally interpreted as "agree" which implies that the School Planning Team agrees on the given indicators. The top five responses on the result of the survey questionnaire revealed that participants agreed that they understand the concepts and ideas of School Improvement Participants are very much familiar with the concerned stakeholders of their school. Likewise, they are well-informed about their duties and responsibilities as part of the School Planning Team, they strictly follow the steps and phases provided by DepEd in the formulation and implementation of the SIP, and they are aware of each part and step of the School Improvement Plan. These indicators were also the frequent answers of the school heads during the interviews in the qualitative phase of the study.

Based on the results, orientation was done by the school to further inform the school planning about the concepts and steps in the formulation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Further, it serves as a scaffold where duties and responsibilities, and mission and vision sharing can be done among the teams. The steps and phases provided by DepED were strictly followed by the schools as well, but modification was done to make the process faster without compromising the quality of the output.

B. Level of Stakeholders' Involvement in the Different Phases of SIP

Based on the results of the interview with the respondents, preparatory activities were done that included data gathering, orientation, vision sharing, identifying roles and responsibilities, identifying and discussion of Priority Improvement Areas, root cause analysis, and listening to the voice of the stakeholders through regular meetings. The manner by which plan was guided and implemented through stakeholders' support was included.

During the data gathering period, selected stakeholders were tasked to collect necessary information to identify the Priority Improvement Areas. Data were presented and analyzed during the Assess Phase. Some schools enumerated the help provided by its stakeholders in this phase; the teachers

provided needed information relative to teaching and learning process. Parents on the other hand shared valuable information about their support for the school. Learners extended support and cooperation from the very start. The Barangay officials or Local Government Unit shared valuable information in the interest of the community in school improvement. Schools also confirmed the organization of Project teams (people in-charge of the projects in SIP) who have regular meetings about their assigned projects. Projects and programs formulated in the SIP were presented among the stakeholders especially among the teachers and parents as confirmed by the respondents.

In the School Improvement Plan Guidebook (DepEd, 2015a), the cycle of SIP begins with the Assess phase, School Planning Team (SPT) identifies the Priority Improvement Areas (PIAs) and objectives are set. In this phase the team also listens to the voice of the learners and other stakeholders. Then analyze the school data and processes to determine the root cause of each (Priority Improvement Area (PIA). Responses from the Principals gained during the interviews were in consonance with the policy.
It was observed that schools have common practices during the assess phase. Orientation was done by most of the schools interviewed. Stakeholders are requested to attend the said event where various activities are done like gathering of data, DepED mission and vision sharing, identifying and discussion of Roles and Responsibilities, identifying role and responsibilities, etc. It was also observed that each school has their own unique strategy in doing the steps.

Moreover, part of the steps under this phase is listening to the voice of the learners and stakeholders. In the study of Lopez-Reyna et al. (2012), part of the critical features of program improvement was the use of stakeholders input and feedback. It appears in this study that changes and reforms are best accomplished when the participants are responsible for determining both what they wanted to focus on and the pace at which they wish to progress. This may be one of the most crucial parts of the entire

process, so it should not be skipped. This way, insights can be gained and the school processes that need to be improved or planned can be analyzed.

To further understand the extent of stakeholders' involvement in the formulation and implementation of School Improvement Plan, each phase from Assess Phase to Act Phase was discussed. Practices that require stakeholders' involvement in each phase were used as indicators.

Table 1 shows the level of participation of stakeholders in the formulation of School improvement plan during the Assess phase. The level of participation of stakeholders in the formulation of School Improvement Plan during the Assess Phase had an overall mean rating of 4.06 which denotes a high descriptive rating for the level of participation. This means that the indicators stated are manifested and observed in the participating schools.

The top three responses on the result of the survey questionnaire prove that there is a high level of involvement when stakeholders are informed about the DepED mission and vision, core values and division and school goals. It was followed by the involvement of stakeholders on presentation of their Roles and Responsibilities of the School Planning Team and Stakeholders being discussed and agreed. Lastly, a high level of involvement when Priority Improvement Areas are identified based on the data from the different stakeholders.

However, the least three responses denote a high level of participation too, but there is still a need to encourage the stakeholders to participate. This includes their involvement before the planning session where stakeholders are invited by the school for the conduct of preparatory activities; meetings conducted to gather and consolidate data among the stakeholders; and Dyad, Triad, Focal Group Discussion and survey conducted among the stakeholders.

Table 2 shows the the level of participation of stakeholders in the formulation of School Improvement Plan during the Plan Phase has an overall mean rating of rating of 4.14 which denotes a high descriptive rating for the level of participation. This means that the indicators stated are manifested and observed in the participating schools.

Table 1: Level of Participation of Stakeholders in the Formulation of School Improvement Plan During the Assess Phase

Indicators	S1 Mean	S2 Mean	S3 Mean	S4 Mean	S5 Mean	S6 Mean	S7 Mean	Average Weighted Mean	Description
1. Before the planning session, stakeholders are invited by the school for the conduct of preparatory activities.	4.20	4.38	3.62	3.38	4.17	3.69	4.32	3.96	High
2. Meetings are conducted to gather and consolidate data among the stakeholders.	4.20	4.31	3.62	3.44	3.91	4.06	4.58	4.02	High
3. Stakeholders are informed about the DepEd's mission and vision, core values and division and school goals.	4.40	4.48	3.92	4.00	3.96	3.94	4.53	4.18	High
4. Roles and Responsibilities of the School Planning Team and Stakeholders are being discussed and agreed.	4.40	4.31	4.08	3.88	3.65	3.94	4.84	4.16	High
5. Priority Improvement Areas are identified based from the gathered data by different stakeholders.	4.20	4.31	4.00	3.75	3.78	4.06	4.53	4.09	High
6. Priority Improvement Areas are discussed and presented among the stakeholders.	4.60	4.17	3.85	3.63	3.70	4.00	4.47	4.06	High
7. The Planning Team listens to all its stakeholders to further be acquainted with the major issues prevailing in their areas concerns.	4.40	4.38	3.77	3.69	3.70	3.88	4.53	4.05	High

Table 1: Continued

Indicators	S1 Mean	S2 Mean	S3 Mean	S4 Mean	S5 Mean	S6 Mean	S7 Mean	Average Weighted Mean	Description
8. The stakeholders give support in analyzing the root causes of the priority improvement areas.	4.40	4.24	3.85	3.69	3.65	4.19	4.47	4.07	High
9. Dyad, Triad, Focal Group Discussion and survey are conducted among the stakeholders.	4.40	3.97	3.85	3.50	3.43	4.25	4.16	3.94	High
General Weighted Mean								4.06	High

Table 2: Level of Participation of Stakeholders in the Formulation of School Improvement Plan During the Plan Phase

Indicators	S1 Mean	S2 Mean	S3 Mean	S4 Mean	S5 Mean	S6 Mean	S7 Mean	Average Weighted Mean	Description
10. The Stakeholders and the Project Team brainstorm collaboratively to formulate feasible solution to identified Priority Improvement Areas.	4.20	4.10	3.69	4.56	3.78	4.13	4.32	4.11	High
11. Suggestions from different stakeholders are heard and considered.	4.60	4.34	3.92	4.50	3.57	3.88	4.37	4.17	High
12. The Project team develops project designs with the help of the stakeholders.	4.60	4.41	4.00	4.63	3.70	3.88	4.26	4.21	Very high
13. The school seeks financial support and others for the implementation of the projects and programs reflected in the SIP.	4.00	4.24	3.69	3.88	3.96	3.31	4.42	3.93	High
14. The school seeks approval of the crafted SIP from the Division Office	4.40	4.52	4.54	4.19	3.91	3.81	4.53	4.27	Very high
General Weighted Mean								4.14	High

Individually taken, a very high level of involvement was found in the indicator: Project team develops project designs with the help of the stakeholders and schools seek approval of the crafted SIP from the Division Office.

Moreover, a high rating for the level of involvement was found in the following: (1) Stakeholders and the Project Team brainstorm collaboratively to formulate feasible solution to identified Priority Improvement Areas; and (2) Suggestions from different stakeholders are heard and considered and school seeks financial support and others for the implementation of the projects and programs reflected in the SIP. Data from the qualitative phase supports the data above as various stakeholders are the ones who develop the project designs with the help of other stakeholders. Each has their own task and shared with others in the process. Regular meetings had to meet the needs and demands of the projects and programs planned on the SIP. Stakeholders support during the Plan phase is also highly encouraged as supported by the data. The key persons play a vital role in the process as each has their own role to play in the formulation of the SIP. Each stakeholder, both internal and external, provides a big support in identifying the priority improvement areas and providing the necessary resources and financial assistance needed by the school. Collaboration among these people is evident among the participating schools.

Table 3 shows the level of participation of stakeholders in the formulation of School Improvement Plan during the Act Phase has an overall mean rating of 4.09 which denotes a high descriptive rating for the level of participation. This means that the indicators stated are manifested and observed in the participating schools.

Table 3: Level of Participation of Stakeholders in the Formulation of School Improvement Plan During the Act Phase

Indicators	S1 Mean	S2 Mean	S3 Mean	S4 Mean	S5 Mean	S6 Mean	S7 Mean	Average Weighted Mean	Description
15. The school communicates to the stakeholders the progress and implementation results of the projects and programs written in the SIP thru meeting, SMEA, or SRC.	4.60	4.45	4.08	4.00	3.87	3.81	4.37	4.17	High
16. The school gathers feedback from concerned stakeholders.	4.60	4.34	3.92	3.88	3.78	3.88	4.53	4.13	High
17. Projects and programs are monitored by the school with the stakeholders during and at the end of the implementation period of the SIP.	4.20	4.48	4.00	3.94	3.74	3.88	4.47	4.10	High
18. The school is strict with its monitoring scheme given monthly, quarterly at the end of the implementation of every program.	4.40	4.38	3.77	3.69	3.78	3.88	4.58	4.07	High
19. The school acts on the gaps and gains based on the results of the SMEA.	4.20	4.38	3.85	3.50	3.83	3.75	4.37	3.98	High
20. The school provides necessary adjustment if problem or issues arise during the implementation stage of SIP.	4.40	4.41	3.92	3.75	3.70	3.88	4.42	4.07	High
General Weighted Mean								4.09	High

Taken individually, all the given indicators above have a high level of involvement including (1)The school communicates to the stakeholders the progress and implementation results of the projects and programs written in the SIP thru meeting, SMEA, or SRC; (2) The school gathers feedback from concerned stakeholders, projects and programs are monitored by the school with the stakeholders during and at the end of the implementation period of the SIP; (3) the school is strict with its monitoring scheme given monthly, quarterly or end of the implementation of every program; (4) the school acts on the gaps and gains based from the results of the SMEA; and (5) the school provides necessary adjustment if problem or issues arise during the implementation stage of SIP.

Schools also highlighted the importance of monitoring in the process during the interviews. The schools have quality assurance teams that strictly monitor the projects and programs every quarter or as needed. Monitoring tool is used and given regularly. Data gathered are forwarded in the office concerned. Based on the responses of the participants, communicating the implementation results among the stakeholders is a common practice among them. However, schools vary on how they communicate their results among the stakeholders. Some do so through meetings or assemblies, School Reports Cards (SRC), Social Media posts, tarpaulin, or brochures.

Strict monitoring of the project is also encouraged in the process to determine the strengths and weakness of a certain project in the SIP, as also observed from the responses. The frequency of monitoring varies; some do it monthly, quarterly or annually depending upon the projects. Some schools have their own monitoring form while some schools make use of the form given by the department. Schools may provide necessary adjustment based on the results of the monitoring and evaluation.

C. Practices on Stakeholders' Involvement in School Improvement Plan

These practices were based on the best and unique practices provided by the participating schools to involve their stakeholders in the formulation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan during the interview phase of the study. The seven high performing schools were asked about at least three unique practices that their schools conduct to involve more stakeholders in the formulation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. It was observed that there are practices that are common among the participating schools, some were just gathered from the guidelines given by the department, and some were unique and distinct from each other.

The indicators below emerged as the practices of the participating schools during the qualitative phase of the study. Table 4 presents the summary of ratings on the extent of how the participating school practice each indicator stated in the formulation and implementation of School Improvement Plan. As shown in the table, the overall descriptive equivalent is "high" with an overall mean of 4.16. This implies that, the participating schools have a high extent of involvement in the different practices stated. The principals shared during the interview, schools formulate and implement their school improvement plan with the help of the stakeholders. It further implies that all stakeholders are working together for the total improvement of the said plan.

Table 4: Weighted Mean Score as Perceived by the Seven High Performing Schools on their Practices on Stakeholders' Involvement in the Formulation and Implementation of School Improvement Plan

Indicators	S1 Mean	S2 Mean	S3 Mean	S4 Mean	S5 Mean	S6 Mean	S7 Mean	Average Weighted Mean	Description
1. The school invites representative of every group of stakeholders that may help in the crafting and implementing different programs and projects initiated for SIP.	4.00	4.17	4.15	4.25	4.04	3.81	4.21	4.09	High
2. The SIP is guided and evolved through the leadership of the school and participation of invited school community leaders.	4.00	4.24	4.08	4.13	3.83	4.06	4.63	4.14	High
3. The SIP is enhance with the community performing the leadership roles and the school providing the technical support.	4.40	4.24	4.00	3.88	3.78	4.00	4.37	4.10	High
4. The school and community work as partners, leading the continual review and improvement of the SIP.	4.40	4.31	3.92	3.88	3.74	4.00	4.53	4.11	High
5. The school and community collaboratively define the structure, roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders.	4.20	4.24	3.92	3.63	3.65	4.00	4.37	4.00	High
6. Stakeholders are accountable with different school and community-initiated activities.	4.40	4.21	3.62	3.75	3.78	4.00	4.21	4.00	High

Table 4: Continued

Indicators	S1 Mean	S2 Mean	S3 Mean	S4 Mean	S5 Mean	S6 Mean	S7 Mean	Average Weighted Mean	Description
7. The stakeholders assist the school and school community in sourcing out funds for the projects and programs reflected on the SIP.	4.00	4.24	4.00	3.81	3.83	3.94	4.32	4.02	High
8. The school welcomes volunteers from the community in different activities related to the School Improvement Plan.	4.40	4.93	4.38	4.00	4.04	4.38	4.47	4.37	Very High
9. The school leader and the SPT possess the charisma of good leader and a follower. Be a servant leader.	3.80	4.48	4.46	3.94	3.78	4.25	4.26	4.14	High
10. The school is consistent with the implementation of the different projects and program reflected in the School Improvement Plan.	4.00	4.59	4.08	3.88	3.83	4.31	4.26	4.13	High
11. The school communicates to its stakeholders the progress and accomplishments of the SIP thru meetings, assemblies, and other forms of communication.	4.40	4.55	4.38	4.06	3.83	4.31	4.37	4.27	High
12. The school has an open communication with its stakeholders, listens and considers their feedbacks in the entire process of the SIP to assure the quality of the different projects.	4.40	4.48	4.00	4.00	3.74	4.25	3.89	4.11	High

Table 4: Continued

Indicators	S1 Mean	S2 Mean	S3 Mean	S4 Mean	S5 Mean	S6 Mean	S7 Mean	Average Weighted Mean	Description
13. The school informs the stakeholders what the school really need; be specific of the resources needed in each projects and programs implemented.	4.60	4.55	4.38	3.94	3.83	4.19	4.42	4.27	Very High
14. Stakeholders are provided with easy access to information about the school.	4.40	4.45	3.92	3.88	3.83	4.00	4.32	4.11	High
15. The school is transparent with all the donations and help extended by the stakeholders.	4.60	4.62	4.46	4.06	3.74	4.00	4.47	4.28	Very high
16. The school engages meaningful work in the community to increase level of engagement among stakeholders.	4.40	4.52	4.38	4.13	3.78	4.50	4.32	4.29	Very high
17. The school makes the stakeholders feel that they are "part of the family" in the school community.	4.60	4.62	4.54	4.13	3.91	4.56	4.37	4.39	Very high
18. The school conducts programs like Education Summits and Stakeholders' Day to appreciate and recognized the effort and time given by the stakeholders.	4.40	4.28	4.00	4.00	3.65	4.13	4.42	4.12	High
General Weighted Mean								4.16	High

Individually there is a very high extent of involvement on the following: (1) school welcomes volunteers from the community in different activities related to the School Improvement Plan; (2) communicates to its stakeholders the progress and accomplishments of the SIP thru meetings, assemblies, and other forms of communication; (3) informs the stakeholders what the school really need by being specific of the resources needed in each projects and programs implemented; (4) engages meaningful work in the community to increase level of engagement among stakeholders; and (5) school makes the stakeholders feel that they are "part of the family" in the school community.

Further, a high rating for the extent of involvement of stakeholders on the given practices was found in the following: (1) school invites representative of every group of stakeholders that may help in the crafting and implementing different programs and projects initiated for SIP; (2) SIP should be guided and evolved through the leadership of the school and participation of invited school community leaders; (3) it should be enhanced with the community performing the leadership roles and the school providing the technical support; (4) school and community works as partners, leading the continual review and improvement of the SIP; (5) they should collaboratively define the structure, roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders; (6) stakeholders are accountable with different school and community initiated activities; (7) they also assist the school and school community in sourcing out funds for the projects and programs reflected on the SIP; (8) school leader and the SPT possess the charisma of good leader and a follower; be a servant leader; (9) be consistent with the implementation of the different projects and program reflected in the plan; (10) have has an open communication with its stakeholders; (11) listens and considers their feedbacks in the entire process of the SIP to assure the quality of the different projects; and (12) Stakeholders are provided with easy access to information about the school; and (13) conducts programs like Education Summits and Stakeholders' Day to appreciate and recognized the effort and time given by the stakeholders.

These practices on stakeholders' involvement can be used as guide by the various schools in crafting their own School Improvement Plan. Stakeholders' participation and involvement is required not only during the crafting stage but in the entire cycle of the process. Thus, these practices presented when considered are of help to the school leaders and teachers in their respective schools; these can invite and involve more stakeholders in each phase of the SIP cycle. The goal is collaboration among the members of the school community to create a better plan. As Bruns et al. (2011) confirm, involvement and participation of multiple stakeholders contribute to a better management of schools. The need is very evident; this is further confirmed by the current study, participating schools involve the required members or go beyond depending upon the need of the project in their respective schools. School invites and tapped more stakeholders who are more knowledgeable on a certain issue and concern of the school as reflected in their school plan. Various practices were organized in each phase based from the results of the interviews. These practices were proven to have high involvement among the participating schools that other schools may adapt and use, as they craft and implement their own school plan. Welcoming volunteers and engaging to meaningful works in the community contribute to the increase of stakeholders' involvement which were just some of the highlights of the study that was common among the performing schools. A constant and consistent communication in various forms, thru meetings, social media, and printed media, play a role in the involvement; open communication is required. These are just some of the practices presented in the proposed principles and guidelines that schools may apply based from their need. Some practices were neglected by the schools which cause some problems in the involvement of the key stakeholders: The goal of the study is to help other schools identify practices and guidelines to increase and involve more stakeholders. This was designed to provide schools an adequate knowledge on School Improvement Plan and stakeholders' involvement in the process to better serve their respective schools. Moreover, it helps schools build a better and stronger relationship among their stakeholders specifically in the formulation and implementation of SIP.

Findings

Based on the data collected, the School Planning Team (SPT) of the participating schools generally agreed that they understand the general concept of School Improvement Plan (SIP). It was observed that the definitions of the stakeholders were aligned and similar to the definition given by the Department of Education (DepED) though some schools provide modifications based from their set priorities. Moreover, common concepts were observed from the given meanings. This includes the consistent support from the stakeholders during the entire process.

The extent of the stakeholders' involvement in the formulation and implementation of School Improvement Plan is high during the Asses Phase. A common set of practices emerged such as orientation, data gathering, DepED mission and vision sharing, identifying and discussion of roles and responsibilities, identifying role and responsibilities, listening to the voice of the customers, root cause analysis, gap analysis; regular meetings and dialogues, identifying priority improvement areas; brainstorming of possible solution, funds and resources sourcing, monitoring and evaluation, and recognition.

Another set of practices emerged on the Plan Phase where high and very high level of involvement was observed. Schools identified and formulates feasible and possible solution to its Priority Improvement Areas through a collaborative effort. Different groups of stakeholders gave donations of resources and financial assistance in this phase. However, this does not mean that all groups of stakeholders are active in process of the SIP. The willingness of the stakeholders varies as observed from the different schools.

The Act Phase reveals a high level of involvement in the emerged practices. Communication to the stakeholders is a big factor in crafting the SIP in most schools; it is common practice among the respondents. However, schools vary on how they communicate with the stakeholders; through meetings, School Reports Cards (SRC), social media posts, tarpaulin, or brochure. Strict monitoring of the project also differs among the schools and was encouraged in the process.

To invite and involve more stakeholders in the formulation and implementation of SIP, eighteen practices emerged in the study. It was observed that there are good practices that are beneficial to a certain school; common practices done by most, practices that are just part of the guidelines, and distinct practices on specific schools. However, these practices have a high and a very high extent of participation.

Some of the good and common practices were the following: (1) school welcomes volunteers from the community in different activities related SIP; (2) communicates to its stakeholders the progress and accomplishments of the SIP thru meetings, assemblies, and other forms of communication; (3) informs the stakeholders what the school really need; (4) engages meaningful work in the community; (5) assist the school and school community in sourcing out funds for the projects and programs reflected on the SIP; and (6) transparency, and conducts programs like Education Summits and Stakeholders' Day to appreciate and recognized the effort and time given by the stakeholders.

Some practices are based on the guidelines: (1) school invites representative of every group of stakeholders; (2) the SIP should be guided and evolved through the leadership of the school and participation of invited school community leaders; (3) school and community work as partners, leading the continual review and improvement of the SIP; (4) collaboratively define the structure, roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders; (5) consistency with the implementation of the different projects and program; (6) have an open communication with its stakeholders, listens and considers their feedbacks in the entire process of the SIP; and (7) stakeholders are provided with easy access to information about the school.

Some unique practices involve the personal aspect of the leader or school head and the team: (1) School leader and the SPT possess the charisma of good leader and a follower; (2) be a servant leader; (3) school makes the stakeholders feel that they are "part of the family" in the school community; and (4) making the stakeholders accountable with different school and community-initiated activities. Contrary to the practice, (5) SIP should be enhanced with the community performing the leadership roles and the school providing the technical support.

The kind and quality of education that children receive from schools was also considered by the parents as reflected in their responses. The market of the school to gain and involve more stakeholders and motivate these important people help the school more with its projects. It was also observed and evident that stakeholders are willing to help their respective schools in any way possible as reflected in their responses during the interviews.

Conclusion

Stakeholders have a hand and a greater stake in providing assistance to the education of the young learners as they are the agents in the community with the most suitable and adequate resources, and this involvement spells a change. Their role in the formulation of School Improvement Plan is necessary to cater the total development and improvement of the school through collaboration and shared responsibilities.

It was concluded that School Planning Team should understand the basic concepts and process of School Improvement Plan prior to its crafting and implementation. Preparatory activities and Orientations should be done improve the knowledge of the key stakeholders. Some schools invite more stakeholders than required to inform and gain more resources. Teams were created to have a collaborative effort. Stakeholders play a vital role in the process as each has their own role to play. Each stakeholder, both internal and external, provides a big support in formulation and implementation of SIP.

Schools have several practices derived from the guidebook given by the department. There are practices that are commonly applied, and some schools go beyond and apply their own distinct and unique strategy by involving their stakeholders. There are different practices emerged in each phase of the cycle and these may vary depending upon the condition and context of the school. Not all good practices are beneficial to other schools because of others factors to consider. The common practices of performing schools can be suggested because of its consistency in the process as perceived by different stakeholders. The personal characteristic of the leader and the team can also build strong partnerships among stakeholders. The

leadership skills and charisma possessed by the team can be a good practice to some schools, as seen from the results. The practices emerged in the study were proven to be effective on the participating schools. Though factors and things may vary, this can serve as spring board in creating a community-based school plan.

The quality of education offered by schools can be considered a factor on stakeholders' involvement. Parents show consistent support in school in order to give back to them. The willingness of these parents to provide the resources needed was evident: this to help the school produce quality students. The willingness of these stakeholders to provide support in the different projects and programs of the participating schools was observed. They just need proper venues and opportunities to help and provide resources to their respective schools.

Communication is also a key. Consistent communication among the key stakeholders all throughout the process of the School Improvement Plan is a need. Different venues can be used like dialogues, social media, letters, tarpaulin, and brochures. It is deemed important to advocate and communicate to the stakeholders the situation, context, and performance of the school.

References

Anchilo, L. M. (2012) *Supervisory management guidelines in the implementation of School Improvement Plan (SIP)*. Manila: Philippine Normal University.

Bruns, B., Filmer, D. and Patrinos, H. A. (2011) Making schools work: New evidence on accountability reforms. [Online URL: http://siteresources. worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1298568319076/ makingschoolswork.pdf] accessed on March 7, 2018.

Department of Education. (2012) Revised school-based management assessment tool. [Online URL: https://depedkoronadalcity.files. wordpress.com/2012/10/revised-sbm-assessment-tool-as-of-august-12-2012.pdf] accessed on March 7, 2018.

Department of Education. (2015a) The School Improvement Plan (SIP) guidebook. [Online URL: www.deped.gov.ph/sites/default/files/order/_44_0.pdf] accessed on March 7, 2018.

Department of Education. (2015b) DO 44, s. 2015 - Guidelines on the enhanced school improvement planning (SIP) process and the School Report Card (SRC) [Online URL: http://www.deped.gov.ph/ orders/do-44-s-2015] accessed on March 7, 2018.

Ice, M., Thapa, A. and Cohen, J. (2015) Recognizing community voice and a youth-led school-community partnership in the school climate improvement process. *School Community Journal* 25(1): 9-28.

Lopez-Reyna, N. A., Snowden, P. A., Stuart, N. M., Baumgartner, D. and Maiorano, M. J. (2012) Critical features of program improvement: Lessons from five minority serving universities. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning* 2(3): 186-199.

Olguin, D. L. and Keim, J. (2009) Using stakeholders as career bridges to advance students' academic performance: How would you like your stake*? Journal of School Counseling* 7: 1-22.

Preston, J. P. (2013) Community involvement in school: Social relationships in a bedroom community. *Canadian Journal of Education* 36(3): 413-437.

Smith, C. F. and Goodwin, D. (2014) A guided empowerment self-audit as a school improvement strategy. *Research in Higher Education Journal* 25: 1-22.

Tobergte, D. R. and Curtis, S. (2013) Do you see what I see? The impact of school accountability on parent, teacher, and student perceptions of the school environment. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 53(9): 1689-1699.

World Bank. (2008) What is school based management? [Online URL: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200 -1099079877269/547664-1099079934475/5476671145313948551/ what_is_SBM.pdf] accessed on March 7, 2018.