
Engagement of Secondary Teachers in School Improvement Planning: Basis for Professional Adjustment

JAYSON F. ESTEBAN
MARA G. PELAEZ, PhD
Urdaneta City University

Abstract — This study examined the level of teachers' engagement in School-Based Management (SBM) in relation to School Improvement Planning (SIP) in public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Pangasinan II during School Year 2025–2026. Anchored on Fullan's Theory of Educational Change and Participatory Decision-Making Theory, it emphasized the importance of collaboration and shared governance in school improvement. Using a descriptive research design, data were collected from 369 teachers through a structured questionnaire covering key SIP dimensions, including planning, implementation, evaluation, and professional development.

Findings revealed that teachers demonstrated a generally high level of engagement, particularly in implementation and professional development activities. However, lower engagement was observed in strategic planning and external partnerships. Significant differences were found when grouped according to teaching position, educational attainment, years of service, and SBM-related training. The study concluded that targeted capacity-building programs are necessary to further strengthen teacher participation and enhance effective and collaborative school improvement planning processes.

Keywords: *School-Based Management, School Improvement Planning, teacher engagement, participatory governance, professional development, descriptive-comparative research*

I. INTRODUCTION

Decentralization of education governance is widely recognized as a key reform strategy for improving school effectiveness, accountability, and stakeholder participation. Globally, school based management (SBM) promotes the transfer of decision making authority from centralized offices to local stakeholders such as school heads, teachers, parents, and community members to foster collaborative governance, participatory decision making, and responsiveness to local needs (Suh, 2021; Consolacion, Poblete, & De Castro, 2024; Kimilat & Baguio, 2025). Research consistently shows that effective decentralized governance strengthens institutional accountability, leadership practices, and school community partnerships, ultimately contributing to improved learner outcomes.

In many countries, the implementation of school based management emphasizes the active involvement of teachers in school governance and improvement planning. Teachers are considered key stakeholders in shaping instructional practices, identifying learning challenges, and implementing strategies that improve student performance. Studies highlight that when teachers participate in school planning and decision making processes, they demonstrate stronger professional commitment, improved collaboration with school leaders, and greater responsibility in achieving institutional goals (Nguyen & Hallinger, 2022; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2023). As a result, teacher engagement has become a critical factor in the successful implementation of school management reforms worldwide.

The global emphasis on participatory school governance is also closely aligned with the goals of the United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda, particularly Sustainable Development Goal 4 which aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. Achieving this goal requires strong educational leadership, effective school management, and active participation of teachers in planning and implementing school improvement initiatives (UNESCO, 2023; United Nations, 2024). Teachers play a central role in delivering quality instruction and supporting the development of educational programs that respond to the diverse needs of learners.

One important mechanism that supports school improvement within decentralized education systems is the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SIP serves as a strategic planning

tool that allows schools to identify priority areas, set achievable goals, and implement programs that address institutional challenges. It also provides a structured process for monitoring school performance and evaluating the effectiveness of implemented strategies. International studies suggest that collaborative development of improvement plans strengthens school leadership, encourages shared responsibility among stakeholders, and promotes continuous institutional development (Harris & Jones, 2022; Day, Sammons, & Gu, 2023).

Teacher engagement in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan is therefore essential for achieving meaningful and sustainable school improvement. Teachers possess first hand knowledge of classroom realities and student learning needs, making their participation crucial in designing practical and effective improvement strategies. Research indicates that schools with high levels of teacher involvement in improvement planning often demonstrate stronger professional collaboration, better instructional practices, and improved student learning outcomes (Nguyen, 2024; Kimilat & Baguio, 2025).

Despite the recognized importance of teacher engagement in school governance and planning processes, some education systems still face challenges in ensuring active participation among teachers. Factors such as heavy workloads, limited training in leadership and planning, and insufficient opportunities for involvement in decision making may affect the extent of teacher participation in school management activities. These challenges highlight the need to further examine how teachers engage in school based management initiatives and how their involvement contributes to the effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan

Consistent with global education reforms that promote decentralized governance and participatory leadership in schools, the Philippine education system has also adopted school based management as a key strategy for improving school effectiveness and accountability. The Department of Education institutionalized school based management to empower schools to make informed decisions based on their specific needs while strengthening collaboration among school heads, teachers, parents, and community stakeholders (Department of Education, 2021; Abulon & Balagtas, 2022). Similar to international practices, this approach aims to enhance school governance by encouraging shared responsibility and active participation in planning and implementing educational programs that support improved learner outcomes.

Within the Philippine context, school based management is closely linked to the implementation of the School Improvement Plan, which serves as a strategic framework that guides schools in identifying priority needs, setting development goals, and implementing programs to improve teaching and learning conditions. The School Improvement Plan provides a structured process for school leaders and teachers to collaboratively analyze school performance data, design interventions, and monitor the progress of improvement initiatives. Studies have emphasized that collaborative planning through the School Improvement Plan strengthens institutional leadership, enhances teacher participation, and promotes accountability within schools (David & Albert, 2023; Domingo, 2024).

Teachers play a crucial role in the successful implementation of school based management and the School Improvement Plan in Philippine schools. As frontline educators, teachers possess direct knowledge of classroom realities and student learning needs, making their involvement essential in identifying challenges and designing practical strategies for school improvement. Research in the Philippine education system indicates that when teachers actively participate in school planning and decision making processes, they demonstrate stronger professional commitment, improved collaboration with school leaders, and greater ownership of school programs and initiatives (Abulon & Balagtas, 2022; David & Albert, 2023).

Furthermore, strengthening participatory governance in Philippine schools contributes to the country's commitment to achieving Sustainable Development Goal 4, which focuses on ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all. Achieving this global goal requires effective school leadership, continuous professional engagement of teachers, and strong collaboration among stakeholders in planning and implementing educational reforms. Teachers therefore play a central role in translating education policies into effective classroom practices that support improved learning outcomes and sustainable school development (UNESCO, 2023; United Nations, 2024).

Despite the institutionalization of school based management in the Philippines, several studies indicate that challenges still exist in ensuring consistent teacher engagement in school governance and improvement planning. Factors such as workload demands, limited training in leadership and planning processes, and varying levels of participation in decision making may

influence the extent to which teachers engage in school improvement initiatives (Domingo, 2024; Kimilat & Baguio, 2025). These challenges highlight the importance of examining how teachers participate in school based management activities, particularly in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan

In the Schools Division of Pangasinan II, secondary schools operate within diverse socio-economic and geographic contexts that influence the implementation of school based management. Although DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2022 mandates schools to develop and implement School Improvement Plans (SIP), division-level reports and technical assistance findings indicate uneven adoption and practice. Common challenges include heavy teacher workloads, limited training in planning and leadership, varying levels of administrative support, and resource constraints (Dela Cruz & Galang, 2024; Nabus & Homillano, 2025). These conditions suggest that policy compliance does not necessarily translate into effective teacher engagement in school improvement initiatives.

Consequently, there remains a lack of context-specific, empirical evidence on how teachers actually participate in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan in public secondary schools in Pangasinan II. Limited research has examined the extent to which teachers are actively involved in planning, decision-making, program implementation, and monitoring, as well as the factors that enable or hinder meaningful engagement in school-based management activities within this local context.

This study was significant as it provided empirical, context-based insights into teacher engagement in School-Based Management and the School Improvement Plan within the Schools Division of Pangasinan II. By examining teachers' roles, processes, and participation, the study contributed to a more nuanced understanding of collaborative school governance beyond policy compliance.

The findings benefited school heads by informing strategies to strengthen teacher engagement in instructional leadership and school improvement planning. Teachers and non-teaching personnel gained a clearer understanding of their responsibilities within a participatory management framework, while parents and community members were encouraged to support school programs more actively.

At the institutional level, the Schools Division of Pangasinan II and DepEd policymakers used the findings to refine policies, design targeted capacity-building programs for teachers, and enhance monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for the effective implementation of the School Improvement Plan. More broadly, the study supported national and global efforts, including Sustainable Development Goal 4, to promote inclusive and equitable quality education, accountable school governance, and collaborative partnerships by identifying ways to improve teacher engagement and school performance.

Literature Review

The study on teachers' engagement in School-Based Management (SBM) was anchored on two key theories that provided a framework for understanding the dynamics of teacher participation in school governance, planning, and improvement initiatives.

Fullan's Theory of Educational Change (Fullan, 2007) emphasized that sustainable school improvement required the active engagement of all stakeholders, particularly teachers, who were the primary agents of instructional and organizational change. According to this theory, the effectiveness of school reform initiatives such as SBM depended on teachers' motivation, professional capacity, and collaboration with school leaders and peers. In the context of Pangasinan II schools, teacher engagement in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan allowed educators to contribute their classroom expertise, provide feedback on instructional strategies, and ensure that improvement initiatives addressed local learner needs. Fullan's theory underscored the importance of aligning teacher participation with school goals to achieve meaningful and sustainable improvements in student learning outcomes, while promoting shared responsibility and accountability among school stakeholders.

Participatory Decision-Making Theory (Vroom & Yetton, 1973) focused on how decision-making in organizations was enhanced when individuals affected by decisions were actively involved in the process. Applied to SBM, this theory explained that involving teachers in school improvement planning fostered ownership, collaboration, and commitment to school goals. Teachers who participated in decisions related to curriculum implementation, resource allocation,

and program evaluation were more likely to support and sustain improvement initiatives. In Pangasinan II, the degree of teacher participation varied depending on school leadership practices, institutional culture, and the availability of professional development opportunities, but participatory approaches generally led to more effective planning, higher teacher morale, and stronger engagement in school-based improvement efforts.

Together, these theories provided a foundation for analyzing how teacher engagement contributed to the effective development and implementation of School Improvement Plans. Fullan's Theory of Educational Change emphasized the central role of teachers in driving instructional and organizational reforms, while Participatory Decision-Making Theory highlighted how inclusive decision-making processes strengthened ownership, collaboration, and accountability.

By applying these theoretical perspectives to the context of SBM in Pangasinan II, this study examined both the practical involvement of teachers in school planning and the structural and leadership factors that enabled or hindered meaningful participation. This framework supported the investigation of how school heads implemented strategies to promote teacher engagement, how teachers perceived their roles and responsibilities in school improvement planning, and how these dynamics influenced the overall quality and effectiveness of SBM. Ultimately, integrating these perspectives provided a conceptual lens for understanding the interplay between teacher participation, school leadership practices, and school improvement outcomes within the local context.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the level of teachers' engagement in School-Based Management (SBM) in relation to school improvement planning in public schools in the Division of Pangasinan II, during School Year 2025–2026.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of the following:
 - a) teaching position;
 - b) highest educational attainment;
 - c) number of years in service; and
 - d) relevant in-service trainings attended related to School-Based Management (SBM)?
2. What is the level of engagement of teachers in School Improvement Planning in terms of:
 - a) needs assessment and problem solving;
 - b) goal setting and visioning;
 - c) strategy development;
 - d) implementation and action;
 - e) monitoring and evaluating;
 - f) professional development; and
 - g) building relationship?

-
3. Is there significant difference in the level of engagement of teachers in School Improvement Planning when grouped according to their profile variables?
 4. What professional development adjustment can be proposed to capacitate teachers in participating in school improvement planning?

II. METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, profile of respondents, extent of teachers' participation in School Based Management (SBM), strategic practices of school heads, data gathering instruments, data gathering procedures, data processing and analysis, and ethical considerations.

Research Design and Strategy

This study employed a descriptive research design to determine the level of engagement of teachers in School-Based Management (SBM) in relation to the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and to examine differences in engagement across selected teacher profile variables. The descriptive aspect of the design was used to provide a detailed account of the teachers' profiles and their engagement in the key dimensions of the SIP, including needs assessment and problem solving, goal setting and visioning, strategy development, implementation and action, monitoring and evaluation, professional development, and building relationships.

The respondents of the study consisted of public secondary school teachers from selected schools in the Schools Division of Pangasinan II who were actively involved in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Teachers serving in curriculum and planning committees or other SBM-related activities were purposively selected to ensure that participants had direct experience with school improvement initiatives. Teacher profile data were collected through structured questionnaires and official school records.

Population and Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in selected public secondary schools under the Schools Division of Pangasinan II during the School Year 2025–2026. The respondents of the study consisted of public secondary school teachers who were actively involved in the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) and school improvement planning activities in their respective schools. These teachers were selected because of their direct participation in planning, implementing, and monitoring school programs and initiatives related to school improvement.

To ensure adequate representation, respondents were randomly selected from different secondary schools across the three congressional districts of Pangasinan II. The selection also considered the distribution of teachers from various schools to capture diverse experiences and perspectives regarding their engagement in School Improvement Planning under the SBM framework.

The Schools Division of Pangasinan II served as the locale of the study because it comprised numerous public secondary schools that varied in size, teacher population, and level of SBM implementation. This diversity provided a suitable setting for examining teachers' engagement in the different phases of School Improvement Planning, particularly in terms of needs assessment and problem solving, goal setting and visioning, strategy development, implementation and action, monitoring and evaluation, professional development, and building relationships.

Relevant data regarding the profile of the respondents, such as teaching position, highest educational attainment, number of years in service, and relevant in-service trainings related to SBM, were collected through a structured questionnaire. These data provided the necessary background information for analyzing the level of teachers' engagement in School Improvement Planning. The total population of secondary school teachers in the Schools Division of Pangasinan II, including both Junior High School and Senior High School, was 4,833. Using Slovin's Formula with a 5% margin of error, the computed sample size was 369 respondents, who served as the final participants of the study. The respondents were selected using proportionate stratified random sampling, ensuring that each school and stratum within the population was adequately represented. After stratification, individual respondents were chosen through simple random sampling to ensure equal opportunity of selection and to minimize bias in the sampling process.

Data Gathering Tool

The primary instrument used in this study was a self-administered questionnaire designed to determine the level of teachers' engagement in School-Based Management (SBM) in relation to School Improvement Planning (SIP) in public secondary schools in the Division of Pangasinan II during the School Year 2025–2026. The questionnaire was structured to collect information aligned with the objectives of the study, specifically to describe the respondents' profiles and assess their level of participation in key areas of the SIP.

The instrument was composed of two main parts. The first part gathered data on the profile of the respondents, including teaching position, highest educational attainment, number of years in service, and relevant in-service trainings attended related to SBM. The second part measured the level of engagement of teachers in School Improvement Planning, covering dimensions such as needs assessment and problem solving, goal setting and visioning, strategy development, implementation and action, monitoring and evaluation, professional development, and building relationships. Responses were recorded using a Likert-type scale, ranging from Highly Engaged, Moderately Engaged, Engaged, to Not Engaged, allowing the researcher to quantify the degree of participation of teachers in each dimension.

The questionnaire was developed based on the provisions of DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024, which emphasizes teacher involvement in participatory school governance and planning. To ensure its reliability and validity, the instrument was reviewed by educational management experts, particularly three secondary school principals, one master teacher, and one head teacher who are experts in the field of the study, and was pilot-tested with a small group of teachers before full administration. The reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha showed that the instrument has good to excellent internal consistency, with domain values of 0.842 (Needs Assessment and Problem Solving), 0.851 (Goal Setting and Visioning), 0.851 (Strategy Development), 0.839 (Implementation and Action), 0.825 (Monitoring and Evaluating), and 0.852 (Professional Development), and an overall reliability coefficient of 0.946, indicating excellent reliability. The data collected through this instrument provided the foundation for descriptive and comparative analyses, enabling the study to determine teachers' profiles, levels of engagement, and areas that

may require professional development or other interventions to enhance their participation in School Improvement Planning.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher first sought permission from the Schools Division Office (SDO) of Pangasinan II to conduct the study in selected public secondary schools. Upon approval, coordination was made with the school heads of the identified schools to request permission to administer the survey questionnaire to the teacher-respondents. This process ensured that the study followed proper protocols and that the respondents were appropriately informed about the research.

After securing the necessary approvals, the researcher identified teacher-respondents who participated in the study. The respondents were teachers currently employed in the selected public secondary schools who were involved in School-Based Management (SBM) and school improvement planning activities. Their participation provided relevant information regarding their level of engagement in the different phases of School Improvement Planning.

The researcher then administered the validated survey questionnaire to the selected respondents. Before distributing the instrument, the purpose and objectives of the study were explained to the participants to ensure that they clearly understood the significance of the research and their role in it. Clear instructions were also provided on how to answer the questionnaire to avoid confusion and ensure accurate responses.

After the respondents had completed the questionnaire, the researcher collected, checked, and organized the accomplished instruments. The gathered data then were tallied, tabulated, and prepared for statistical analysis. The results were analyzed to determine the level of teachers' engagement in School Improvement Planning in terms of needs assessment and problem solving, goal setting and visioning, strategy development, implementation and action, monitoring and evaluation, professional development, and building relationships.

All information gathered from the respondents was treated with strict confidentiality and was used solely for the purpose of this research. The identities of the participants were not disclosed, and the data collected were carefully stored and protected.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the respondents in terms of Teaching position, Highest educational attainment, Number of years in service, and Relevant in-service trainings attended related to School-Based Management (SBM)

TABLE 1
PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Table 1 presents the profile of the respondents in terms of their teaching position, highest educational attainment, number of years in service, and relevant in-service trainings attended related to School-Based Management (SBM). This information provides a general overview of the professional background of the participants, which is essential in understanding their level of experience, qualifications, and exposure to SBM practices. Examining these variables allows for a clearer interpretation of how teachers' profiles may influence their engagement in School Improvement Planning (SIP) and related school governance processes.

Moreover, the profile data help establish the context in which the study was conducted, particularly in identifying the dominant characteristics of the respondents. It also allows for comparison across different groups to determine whether variations in engagement may be attributed to specific professional factors. Ultimately, this information serves as a basis for analyzing relationships between respondents' characteristics and their level of participation in SBM and SIP activities.

Variable	Variable Category	Frequency	Percentage
Teaching Position	Teacher I	51	13.8%
	Teacher II	140	37.9%
	Teacher III	149	40.4%
	Master Teacher I	23	6.2%
	Master Teacher II	6	1.6%
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree	130	35.2%
	Master's Degree	195	52.8%
	Doctorate Degree	44	11.9%
Number of Years in Service	1 year and below	18	4.9%
	1-5 years	94	25.5%
	6-10 years	212	57.5%
	11-15 years	12	3.3%
	16-20 years	33	8.9%
Relevant In-Service Trainings Attended Related to School-Based Management	School-Based	316	85.6%
	District Level	9	2.4%
	Division Level	22	6.0%
	Regional Level	12	3.3%
	National Level	10	2.7%

Teaching Position. The data on teaching position show that the majority of the respondents are in the mid-level teaching ranks. Specifically, Teacher III has the highest proportion with 149

respondents (40.4%), followed closely by Teacher II with 140 respondents (37.9%). This indicates that most participants are relatively experienced teachers who have already progressed beyond entry-level positions. Meanwhile, Teacher I, which typically represents beginning teachers, comprises 51 respondents (13.8%), suggesting a smaller proportion of less experienced educators in the sample. On the other hand, only a few respondents hold higher-ranking positions, with Master Teacher I at 23 (6.2%) and Master Teacher II at 6 (1.6%).

The distribution implies that the study largely reflects the perspectives of experienced classroom teachers rather than novice or highly senior educators. This may suggest that the findings on engagement in School-Based Management (SBM) and school improvement planning are grounded in the insights of teachers who already have substantial teaching experience and are likely more involved in school-level decision-making processes.

This distribution of respondents is consistent with findings in recent education studies emphasizing that School-Based Management (SBM) participation is commonly dominated by mid-career teachers who are actively involved in instructional and school governance functions. According to the OECD (2021), teachers with moderate years of service are more likely to participate in collaborative school decision-making due to their balance of experience and active classroom responsibilities. Similarly, the UNESCO (2022) report on teacher involvement in school leadership highlights that mid-level teachers often serve as key implementers of school improvement initiatives, as they possess both sufficient experience and ongoing exposure to institutional practices. In addition, the Department of Education (DepEd, 2023) emphasizes that Teacher II and Teacher III positions are typically more engaged in School Improvement Planning (SIP) activities compared to entry-level teachers, as they are frequently assigned to committees and planning teams.

TABLE 2
LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT OF TEACHERS IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
PLANNING NN NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND PROBLEM SOLVING

Indicator statement: As a teacher, I...	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Participate in school-level assessments to identify learning gaps and resource needs.	3.57	Highly Engaged
2. Collect feedback from learners, parents, and colleagues to understand challenges affecting learning outcomes.	3.75	Highly Engaged
3. Prioritize identified problems based on urgency and impact on learners and school performance.	3.47	Highly Engaged
4. Analyze data to develop evidence-based solutions for school issues.	3.44	Highly Engaged
5. Review previous problem-solving efforts to improve future strategies and interventions.	3.30	Highly Engaged
OVERALL	3.51	Highly Engaged

Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 Highly Engaged, 2.51 – 3.25 Engaged, 1.76 – 2.50 Slightly Engaged, 1.00 – 1.75 Not Engaged

The table 2 indicates that teachers demonstrate a highly engaged level of involvement in school improvement planning in terms of needs assessment and problem solving, as reflected by an overall mean of 3.51. This suggests that teachers are consistently and actively participating in identifying school needs, analyzing problems, and contributing to solution-building processes. Such a high level of engagement implies that teachers are not merely implementers of plans but are actively involved in data-driven decision-making, which is essential in strengthening School-Based Management (SBM) practices. This further indicates that schools in the Division of

Pangasinan II benefit from collaborative and participatory planning processes, where teachers play a central role in improving educational outcomes.

This finding is supported by recent studies emphasizing the importance of teacher engagement in school improvement initiatives. Harris and Jones (2021) highlight that active teacher participation in needs assessment and problem-solving processes leads to more responsive and sustainable school improvement efforts. Similarly, Datnow and Park (2022) stress that data-informed decision-making is most effective when teachers are deeply involved in analyzing and interpreting school data. Furthermore, Leithwood, Sun, and Pollock (2023) assert that teacher engagement in collaborative problem-solving enhances school effectiveness and fosters a culture of continuous improvement.

The highest weighted mean is observed in the indicator “Collect feedback from learners, parents, and colleagues to understand challenges affecting learning outcomes,” with a mean score of 3.75 interpreted as highly engaged. This indicates that teachers excel in gathering stakeholder feedback, demonstrating strong collaboration and communication with the school community. The implication of this result is that teachers recognize the importance of inclusive decision-making and value the perspectives of various stakeholders in identifying school-related issues. Such practices contribute to more accurate identification of problems and more relevant and effective interventions.

TABLE 3
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT OF TEACHERS IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING WHEN GROUPED ACCORDING TO THEIR PROFILE VARIABLES

	Teaching Position		Highest Educational Attainment		Number of Years in Service		Relevant in-service trainings attended to School-Based Management(SBM)	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Needs Assessment and Problem solving	33.50	5.39e-11	9.162	1.82e-4	8.28	2.11e0-6	8.25	2.25e0-6
Goal Setting and Visioning	3.00	0.0329	6.967	0.00134	44.18	3.15e-30	4.69	0.00105
Strategy Development	17.24	1.32e0-7	16.674	3.37e-7	3.22	0.0129	57.5	8.58e-14
Implementation and Action	9.75	2.24e0-5	0.580	0.56168	17.77	2.44e-13	24.7	1.51e0-8
Monitoring and Evaluating	1.92	0.1321	18.928	7.49e-8	19.51	1.47e-14	12.48	1.60e0-9
Professional Development	7.17	3.16e0-4	13.062	7.00e-6	23.53	2.54e-17	6.90	2.29e0-5
Building Relationship	16.98	1.09e0-7	7.851	6.80e-4	11.10	1.67e0-8	6.83	2.61e0-5

As for the profile variable teaching position, there is a significant difference in almost all areas of engagement (Needs Assessment, Goal Setting, Strategy Development, Implementation, Professional Development, and Building Relationships) when teachers are grouped by their position, with one notable exception which is monitoring and evaluating.

For the profile variable highest educational attainment, education level plays a major role in how teachers engage with the SIP, showing significant differences in nearly every category except for one. There is a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) on level of engagement for the areas Needs Assessment, Goal Setting, Strategy Development, Monitoring/Evaluating, Professional Development, and Building Relationships while for implementation and action, there is no significant difference ($p = 0.56168$). This implies that educational background does not

significantly change the level of effort or engagement when it comes to the physical "doing" or execution of planned activities.

As shown in the table, experience is the most impactful variable. Every single category under "Number of Years in Service" shows a significant difference (all p values are well below 0.05). The extremely low p-values (e.g., $3.15e-30$ for Goal Setting) suggest that a teacher's tenure deeply influences their level of involvement and perspective in every stage of the SIP process.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

The respondents are mostly mid-level to experienced teachers (Teacher II–III), with master's degrees and 6–10 years of service. While they have adequate academic preparation and experience, their exposure to higher-level SBM trainings beyond the school level is limited, which may affect their depth of engagement in school improvement processes. Teachers in the Division of Pangasinan II are generally highly engaged in all areas of School Improvement Planning, showing strong participation and commitment. However, some areas such as reflective practice, strategic alignment, and external partnerships still need improvement. Teachers' engagement in School Improvement Planning significantly varies based on teaching position, educational attainment, years of service, and SBM-related training, indicating that professional background influences their level of participation. There is a need for a structured professional development adjustment to enhance teachers' engagement in SBM and SIP, particularly in strategic planning, reflection, collaboration, and data use, to ensure more effective and consistent participation in school improvement efforts.

Based on the conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were proposed: Based on the findings regarding the respondents' profile, it is recommended that the Schools Division Office of Pangasinan II strengthen and diversify professional development opportunities for teachers, particularly by increasing access to higher-level SBM-related trainings (district, division, regional, and national). Schools may also encourage and support teachers in pursuing

advanced studies and leadership-related qualifications to further enhance their competencies in School-Based Management. Additionally, mentoring programs may be implemented to support less experienced teachers in gradually building capacity for active engagement in school improvement planning. Given that teachers are generally highly engaged but still show variation in specific areas of SIP, it is recommended that schools implement targeted interventions to strengthen weaker domains such as reflective practice, strategic alignment, and external partnership-building. School heads and SBM coordinators should promote structured collaboration, reflective sessions, and data-use training to further deepen teachers' engagement. Strengthening the use of evidence-based planning tools and encouraging consistent stakeholder involvement may also enhance the overall effectiveness of SIP implementation. In view of the significant differences in engagement based on teaching position, educational attainment, years of service, and SBM training exposure, it is recommended that school administrators design differentiated professional development programs tailored to teachers' specific needs and profiles. Leadership opportunities should be expanded for more experienced and highly educated teachers, while capacity-building support should be prioritized for early-career teachers. Furthermore, equitable access to SBM-related training opportunities should be ensured to minimize disparities in engagement levels across teacher groups. It is recommended that the proposed professional development adjustment on School-Based Management (SBM) and School Improvement Planning be formally adopted and implemented by the Schools Division Office of Pangasinan II. The program should be institutionalized as part of continuous in-service training for teachers, with regular monitoring and evaluation to ensure effectiveness. Schools are also encouraged to integrate the program outputs into actual SIP practices to ensure transfer of learning into real school improvement initiatives. Continuous refinement of the program based on feedback and results is also highly recommended to sustain its relevance and impact.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Abulon, V. R., & Balagtas, F. M. (2022). *Teacher involvement and commitment in School-Based Management implementation in public schools in the Philippines*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 15(1), 45–60.
- [2.] Alsaen, M. G. G. (2024). Teachers and parents' level of awareness and implementation of the School-Based Management system in elementary schools in La Trinidad, Benguet. *Dinkum Journal of Social Innovations*, 3(06), 310–317. <https://doi.org/10.71017/djsi.3.6.d-0324>
- [3.] Auerbach, S. (2023). *School leadership for authentic family and community partnerships*. Routledge.
- [4.] Avalos, B. (2023). *Teacher professional learning and school improvement*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 125, 104021.
- [5.] Borko, H., Jacobs, J., & Koellner, K. (2023). *Contemporary approaches to professional development*. Educational Researcher, 52(2), 89–101.
- [6.] Brown, C., Schildkamp, K., & Hubers, M. D. (2022). *Data-based decision making in education: Challenges and opportunities*. Springer.
- [7.] Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2021). *Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better*. Harvard Education Press.
- [8.] Bryson, J. M. (2021). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- [9.] Bush, T. (2023). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- [10.] Campbell, C., & Fullan, M. (2023). *The governance core: School leadership and system improvement*. Corwin Press.

-
- [11.] Cañeda-Dumlao, R. A. (2025). Evaluation of School-Based Management implementation and the level of stakeholders' involvement: Basis for community engagement plan. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, 6(12), 27–38.
- [12.] Century, J., & Cassata, A. (2022). *Implementation research: Finding common ground on what, how, why, where, and who*. *Review of Research in Education*, 46(1), 169–215.
- [13.] Chapman, C., & Muijs, D. (2023). *Improving schools through collaborative leadership*. Routledge.
- [14.] Consolacion, J. T., Poblete, A. R., & De Castro, M. L. (2024). Decentralization and school community participation: Implications of School-Based Management practice. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 9(2), 112–128.
- [15.] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2022). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- [16.] Datnow, A. (2022). *Professional collaboration with purpose: Teacher learning for equitable and excellent schools*. Routledge.
- [17.] David, L. A., & Albert, T. M. (2023). Collaborative planning and teacher participation in School Improvement Plans. *Asia Pacific Journal of School Leadership*, 5(3), 153–170.
- [18.] Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2022). *The impact of leadership on student outcomes*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 58(1), 3–45.
- [19.] Dela Cruz, M. J., & Galang, R. T. (2024). *Teacher engagement in school improvement planning: A local perspective from Pangasinan II*. *Journal of Philippine Educational Research*, 8(4), 88–105.
- [20.] Department of Education. (2021). *Policy guidelines on the implementation of School-Based Management (DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2021)*. DepEd Central Office.
-

-
- [21.] Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2021). *Best practices in teachers' professional development in the United States*. Psychology, Society, & Education, 13(3), 245–258.
- [22.] Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2021). *Best practices in teachers' professional development*. Psychology, Society & Education, 13(3), 245–258.