



Department of Education
Region III
DIVISION OF CITY SCHOOLS
Angeles City
Jesus Street, Pulungbulu, Angeles City

SBM SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL



Document Code: SDO-QF-SGOD-SME-010

Revision: 00

Effectivity date: 10/31/2018

Name of Office: **SGOD - SME**

Name of School: _____

School Type: _____

Location: _____

Date Established: _____

Name of School Head: _____

Last SBM Level/Rating: _____

The Committees (list down the names)

I. LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Chairman: _____
Secretary: _____
Members: _____

II. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Chairman: _____
Secretary: _____
Members: _____

III. ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Chairman: _____
Secretary: _____
Members: _____

IV. MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

Chairman: _____
Secretary: _____
Members: _____

Introduction (Brief background of the school)

I. LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE_A network of leadership and governance guides the education system to achieve its shared vision, mission and goals making them responsive and relevant to the context of diverse environments.

LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE	LEVEL OF PRACTICE				Standard MOVs	Actual MOVs
<p>I. In place is a Development Plan (e.g. SIP) developed collaboratively by the stakeholders of the school and community.</p> <p>Standard MOVs: ESIP AIP DPCRF IPCRF SMEA EBEIS-Performance Indicators such as: Gross Enrolment Rate Net Enrolment Rate Cohort Survival Rate Transition Rate School Leaver Rate Repetition Rate Completion Rate ALS Completion Rate Percentage of ALS learners who completed either elementary or secondary level in accordance with the requirements ALS AGE Passer Rate</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>LEVEL 1 Indicator The development plan guided by the school's vision, mission and goal (VMG) is developed through the leadership of the school and the participation of 50% community stakeholders.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 Indicator The development plan is evolved through the shared leadership of the school and the participation of 51-80% community stakeholders.</p>	<p>LEVEL 3 Indicator The development plan is enhanced with the 81-100 % community participation in performing the leadership roles with the school providing technical support.</p>	<p>School Memo on the Development of Plan (ex. ESIP, AIP, BE-LCP etc.) Minutes of the meeting Attendance Activity Report/Pictures/Narrative</p> <p>ESIP, AIP, Signed by school stakeholders Reviewed by the Division Planning Committee/ Team Certificate Issued</p> <p>Request letter of the Stakeholder from the SH regarding the meeting Minutes of the meeting Attendance Activity Reports/ Pictures</p>	

Percentage of ALS Learners who passed the ALS Accreditation and Equivalency Test Innovative Programs for the improvement of Access						
2. The development plan (e.g. SIP) is regularly reviewed by the school community to keep it up responsive and relevant to emerging needs, challenges and opportunities	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	LEVEL 1 Indicator The school leads the regular quarterly review and improvement of the development plan	LEVEL 2 Indicator The school and 75-80% community stakeholders working as full partners, lead the quarterly review and improvement of the development plan	LEVEL 3 Indicator The school and 81-100 % of the community stakeholders lead the quarterly review and improvement process; the school stakeholders facilitate the process.	Memo/letter on the review and improvement of the ESIP, AIP etc. Minutes of the meeting Attendance Activity Report/ Pictures/ Narrative Request letter of the Stakeholder from stakeholders on the remarks/findings of the review Minutes of the meeting Attendance Activity Reports/ Pictures	

<p>3. The school is organized by a clear structure and work arrangements that promote shared leadership and governance and define the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders.</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>LEVEL 1 Indicator The school defines the organizational structure, and the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 Indicator The school and 51-80% community collaboratively define the structure and the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.</p>	<p>LEVEL 3 Indicator Guided by an agreed organizational structure, the school and 81-100 % of the community stakeholders lead in defining the organizational structure and the roles and responsibilities; school provides technical and administrative support.</p>	<p>Memo/letter on the Organizational Structure and the Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders on ESIP</p> <p>Presentation of the Organization Structure and the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders on ESIP</p> <p>Attendance Activity report/Pictures/Narrative</p> <p>Organizational structure on ESIP with picture</p> <p>Posted on conspicuous places</p> <p>Proofs of the execution of their roles and responsibilities (PPAs)</p>	
	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>LEVEL 1 Indicator A network has been collaboratively established and is continuously improved by the school community yearly.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 Indicator The network actively provides stakeholders information for making decisions and solving learning and administrative problems twice a year.</p>	<p>LEVEL 3 Indicator The network allows easy exchange and access to information sources beyond the school community every quarter.</p>	<p>Memo/Letter on the establishment of communication network</p> <p>Minutes of the meeting in the establishment of communication network</p> <p>Attendance</p> <p>Report/Narrative/Pictorial</p> <p>Communication network (letter, oral, technology-based)</p> <p>Newsletter, leaflet, brochures, orders/memos, management report,</p>	

					bulletin board, etc.)	
5. A long term program is in operation that addresses the training and development needs of school and community leaders.	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	LEVEL 1 Indicator Developing structures are in place and analysis of the competency and development needs of leaders is conducted; result is used to develop a long-term training and development program every year.	LEVEL 2 Indicator Leaders undertake training modes for 2 quarters that are convenient to them (on-line, off-line, modular, group, or home-based) and which do not disrupt their regular functions. Leaders monitor and evaluate their own learning process. .	LEVEL 3 Indicator Leaders assume responsibility for their own training and development every quarter. School community leaders working individually or in groups, coach, and mentor one another to achieve their VMG.	Analysis of the competency and development needs of leaders in: Teachers Students GPTA Community Stakeholders Training on leadership competency and development for planning management Project Proposal Activity Report Attendance Training on Leadership Competency and Development conducted for Teachers, SSG/SPG, PTA & Community Project Proposal Activity Report Attendance pool of experts among the stakeholders/ pool	

Total
Weighted Mean
Weighted Percentage

25%

I. LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Findings:

Recommendations:

Best Features:

SCORE:

Reviewed By:

Approved by:

= Total Score =
5

SBM Principle Leader

SBM Coordinator

II. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION The curriculum learning systems anchored on the community and learner’s contexts and aspirations are collaboratively developed and continuously improved.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION	LEVEL OF PRACTICE				Standard MOVs	Actual MOVs																
<p>1. The curriculum provides for the development needs of all types of learners in the school community</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>Level 1 Indicator All types of learners of the school community are identified, their learning curves assessed; appropriate programs with its support materials for each type of learner is developed with 26-50 percent decrease of the non-numerates and non-literates</p>	<p>Level 2 Indicator Programs are 100% implemented and closely monitored to address performance discrepancies, benchmark best practices, coach low performers, mentor potential leaders, reward high achievement, and maintain environment that makes learning meaningful and enjoyable with 51-75 decrease of the non-numerates and non-literates</p>	<p>Level 3 Indicator The educational needs of all types of learners are being met as shown by continuous improvement on learning outcomes (see the table under the MOVs) and products of learning. Teachers’ as well as students’ performance is motivated by intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards. The schools’ differentiated programs are frequently benchmarked by other schools.</p>	<p>Proportion of students performing at proficient level: 1.Classification of Grades per Learning Area per Grade Level (RM no. 98, s. 2021)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1361 424 1684 676"> <thead> <tr> <th>Proficiency Level (Over all GPA)</th> <th>Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>94-100</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>88-93</td> <td>2.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>82-87</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>76-81</td> <td>1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>75</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>MOVs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMEA • Quarterly GPA • Results of RM no. 98. S. 2021 Survey • Intervention programs/ activities • Individual Monitoring Plans • Rewards mechanism • Evidences of being benchmarked by other schools <p>2.(in the absence of NAT, the results of the reading test in Filipino & English and numeracy test shall be considered.) – with reference to the policy standards set by CLMD.) To determine the improvement of learning outcomes, the rating standard below shall be followed:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1339 1283 1711 1442"> <thead> <tr> <th>% of Decrease</th> <th>Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>76-100% or 0 non-readers/non-numerates</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Proficiency Level (Over all GPA)	Rating	94-100	3	88-93	2.5	82-87	2	76-81	1.5	75	1	% of Decrease	Rating	76-100% or 0 non-readers/non-numerates	3	
Proficiency Level (Over all GPA)	Rating																					
94-100	3																					
88-93	2.5																					
82-87	2																					
76-81	1.5																					
75	1																					
% of Decrease	Rating																					
76-100% or 0 non-readers/non-numerates	3																					

					<table border="1"> <tr> <td>51-75%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26-50%</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25% and below</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table> <p>MOVs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading & Numeracy Pre & Post test results • Phil IRI results • Reading & Numeracy interventions 	51-75%	2	26-50%	1	25% and below	0	
51-75%	2											
26-50%	1											
25% and below	0											
2. The implemented curriculum is localized to make it more meaningful to the learners and applicable to life in the community	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	LEVEL 1 Indicator Local beliefs, norms, values, traditions, folklores, current events, and existing technologies are documented and used to develop a lasting curriculum. Localization guidelines are agreed to by school community and teachers are properly oriented. Developed localized curriculum in 4 learning areas	LEVEL 2 Indicator The localized curriculum is implemented and monitored closely to ensure that it makes learning more meaningful and pleasurable, produces desired learning outcomes, and directly improves community life. Ineffective approaches are replaced and innovative ones are developed. Developed localized curriculum in 6 learning areas.	LEVEL 3 Indicator Best practices in localizing the curriculum are mainstreamed and benchmarked by other schools. There is marked increase in number of projects that uses the community as learning laboratory, and the school as an agent of change for improvement of the community. Developed localized curriculum in all learning areas.	<p>Quality Assured Localized Curriculum - School Level</p> <p>Level 3 = all learning areas (8) Level 2.5 = 7 learning areas Level 2 = 6 learning areas Level 1.5 = 5 learning areas Level 1 = 4 learning areas</p> <p>MOVs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SQAT QA forms • Proposals • Memorandum • List/pictures of quality assured localized materials per learning area • Localization programs/ projects/ activities • Evidences of implementation/ utilization of the localized curriculum/materials 							
3. A representative group of school and community stakeholders	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	Level 1 Indicator A representative team of school and community	Level 2 indicator Learning materials and approaches to reinforce strengths	Level 3 Indicator Materials and approaches are being used in school, in the	<p>Developed Learning Materials (LMs)</p> <p>Level 3 = all learning areas (8) in all grade levels</p>							

<p>develop the methods and materials for developing creative thinking & problem solving</p>		<p>stakeholders assess content and methods used in teaching creative, critical thinking and problem solving. Assessment results are used as guide to develop materials. Developed learning materials in 4 learning areas in all grade levels.</p>	<p>and address deficiencies are developed and tested for applicability on school, family and community. Developed learning materials in 6 learning areas in all grade levels.</p>	<p>family and in community to develop critical, creative thinking and problem solving community of learners and are producing desired results. Developed learning materials in all learning areas in all grade levels.</p>	<p>Level 2.5 = 7 learning areas in all grade levels Level 2 = 6 learning areas in all grade levels Level 1.5 = 5 learning areas in all grade levels Level 1 = 4 learning areas in all grade levels</p> <p>MOVs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals Memorandum List/pictures of Learning Materials per learning area Reports/evidences of the utilization and results of the learning materials 	
					<p>Classroom Action Researches Level 3 = 3 or more Level 2 = 2 Level 1 = 1</p> <p>MOVs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved Proposals Memorandum Copy of action research Reports/evidences of the utilization and results of the research findings/recommendations 	
<p>4. The learning systems are regularly and collaboratively monitored by the community using appropriate tools to ensure the holistic growth and</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>Level 1 Indicator A school- based monitoring and learning system is conducted regularly and cooperatively; and feedback is shared with stakeholders. The system uses a tool</p>	<p>Level 2 indicator The school- based monitoring and learning systems generate feedback that is used for making decisions that enhance the total development of learners for 2</p>	<p>Level 3 Indicator The monitoring system is accepted and regularly used for collective decision making every quarter. The monitoring tool has been improved to provide both</p>	<p>Child Protection Implementation Checklist with evidences/MOVs</p> <p>Level 3 = 81-100% compliance Level 2 = 75-80% compliance Level 1= 50-74% compliance</p> <p>MOVs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MOVs/documents required in the 	

development of the learners and the community.		that monitors the holistic development of learners once a year	quarters. A committee take care of the continuous improvement of the tool.	quantitative and qualitative data.	CPP Implementation Checklist	
5. Appropriate assessment tools for teaching and learning are continuously reviewed and improved, and assessment results are contextualized to the learner and local situation and the attainment of relevant life skills.	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	Level 1 Indicator The assessment tools are reviewed by the school and assessment results are shared with school's stakeholders once a year.	Level 2 indicator The assessment tools are reviewed by the school community and results are shared with community stakeholders for 2 quarters.	Level 3 Indicator School assessment results are used to develop learning programs that are suited to community, and customized to each learner's context, results of which are used for collaborative decision-making every quarter.	Reviewed Assessment Tools/System Level 3 = are reviewed, suited to learners' context and shared to stakeholders every quarter Level 2 = are reviewed and shared to stakeholders for 2 quarters Level 1 = are reviewed and shared to stakeholders once a year MOVs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepared WHLP based on LAS (with comments corrections...) Reviewed/evaluated LAS outputs (portfolio) Evidences of adherence to D.O. 31, s. 2020	
6. Learning managers and facilitators (teachers, administrators and community members) nurture values and environments that are protective of all children and demonstrate behaviors consistent to the organization's	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	Level 1 Indicators. Stakeholders are aware of child/learner-centered, rights-based, and inclusive principles of education. Learning managers and facilitators conduct activities aimed to increase 50% of stakeholders	Level 2 indicators. 75-80% of Stakeholders begin to practice child/learner-centered principles of education in the design of support to education. Learning managers and facilitators apply the principles in	Level 3 Indicators Learning environments methods and resources are community driven, inclusive and adherent to child's rights and protection requirements with 81-100% of stakeholders adherence to child/learner-centered	Child Protection Implementation Checklist with evidences/MOVs Level 3 = 81-100% compliance Level 2 = 75-80% compliance Level 1= 50-74% compliance MOVs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See MOVs/documents required in the CPP Implementation Checklist 	

<p>vision, mission and goals.</p>		<p>awareness and commitment to fundamental rights of children and the basic principle of educating them.</p>	<p>designing learning materials.</p>	<p>principles. Learning managers and facilitators observe learners' rights from designing the curriculum to structuring the whole learning environment.</p>		
<p>7. Methods and resources are learner and community-friendly, enjoyable, safe, inclusive, accessible and aimed at developing self-directed learners. Learners are equipped with essential knowledge, skills, and values to assume responsibility and accountability for their own learning.</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>Level 1 Indicators. Practices, tools and materials for developing self-directed learners are 100% observable in school, but not in the home or in the community. Learning programs are designed and developed to produce learners who are responsible and accountable for their learning.</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators. Practices, tools and materials for developing self-directed learners are observable in the school and 51-80% in the community. The program is collaboratively implemented and monitored by teachers and parents to ensure that it produces desired learners.</p>	<p>Level 3 Indicators. There is continuous exchange of information, sharing of expertise and materials among the schools, home and community for the development of self-directed learners with 81-100% are observable in the school and 81-100% in the home and in the community. The program is mainstreamed but continuously improved to make relevant to emergent demands.</p>	<p><u>Shared practices, tools and materials for the development of self-directed learners</u></p> <p>Level 3 = 81-100% observable in the home and in the community</p> <p>Level 2 = 100% observable in the school and 51-80% in the community</p> <p>Level 1 = 100% observable in school, but not in the home or in the community</p> <p>MOVs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Child Friendly Form • School Guidance & Counselling Programs/Action Plan • Best Practices/Innovative PPAs • Students' achievements, awards, winnings • Evidences of sharing to stakeholders 	

Total _____
Weighted Mean _____
Weighted Percentage 40%

II. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Findings:

Recommendations:

Best Features:

SCORE:

Reviewed By:

Approved by:

= Total Score =
7

SBM Principle Leader

SBM Coordinator

III. ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT A clear, transparent, inclusive, and responsive accountability system is in place, collaboratively developed by the school community, which monitors performance and acts appropriately on gaps and gains.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	LEVEL OF PRACTICE				Standard MOVs	Actual MOVs
<p>1. Roles and responsibilities of accountable person/s and collective body/ ies are clearly defined and agreed upon by community stakeholders.</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>LEVEL 1 Indicator There is an active party that initiates clarification of the roles and responsibilities in education delivery with 50% of stakeholders participation.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 Indicator There is 51-80% stakeholders engagement in clarifying and defining their specific roles and responsibilities.</p>	<p>LEVEL 3 Indicator Shared and participatory processes with 81-100% stakeholders engagement in determining roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of stakeholders in managing and supporting education.</p>	<p>Teachers' Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Faculty Club/Association ▪ SBM Committee ▪ DRRM Committee ▪ SMEA Committee ▪ Adopt-A-School Program Team ▪ Selection and Screening Committee ▪ School Research Committee ▪ School Quality Assurance Team ▪ General Class Program Committee ▪ School Forms Committee ▪ School Grievance Committee ▪ Procurement Management Team <p>* Small School – 3 Medium School – 5 Large School – 7 Mega School – 10 or more</p> <p>Learners' Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SSG/SPG <p>Parents' Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GPTA ▪ HRPTA <p>MOVs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Constitution and By-Laws ▪ Terms of References (Duties and Responsibilities) ▪ Memo on the Designation of Members ▪ Oath of Office ▪ Action Plan 	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accomplishment Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minutes of the Meeting - Attendance - Pictorials - Financial Statement <p>Level 1 – 1 type of stakeholder is engaged with complete MOVs</p> <p>Level 2 – 2 types of stakeholders are engaged with complete MOVs</p> <p>Level 3 – 3 or more types of stakeholders are engaged with complete MOVs</p>	
<p>2. Achievement of goals is recognized based on a collaboratively developed performance accountability system; gaps are addressed through appropriate action.</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>Level 1 Indicators. Performance accountability is practiced at the school level with <i>50% gaps addressed.</i></p>	<p>Level 2 Indicators. A community-level accountability system is evolving from school-led initiatives with <i>51-80% gaps addressed.</i></p>	<p>Level 3 Indicators. A community-accepted performance accountability, recognition and incentive system is being practiced with <i>81-100% gaps addressed.</i></p>	<p>MOV:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. List of identified gaps based on the SMEA report 2. Record of school personnel, learners, and other stakeholders participation in addressing the identified gaps with accomplishment report (narrative, attendance, pictorials, communications, and pledge of support) 3. % of gaps addressed 4. Recognition of stakeholders based on their contribution in addressing the identified gaps with Activity Report (Program, List of Awardees, Certificates/Plaques, Token/ Incentives, and Pictorials) <p>Level 1 – MOV 1 is present</p> <p>Level 2 – MOVs 1 and 2 are present</p> <p>Level 3 – All MOVs are present</p>	

<p>3. The accountability system is owned by the community and is continuously enhanced to ensure that management structures and mechanisms are responsive to the emerging learning needs and demands of the community</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>LEVEL 1 Indicators. The school articulates the accountability assessment framework with basic components, including implementation guidelines to the 50 % of stakeholders.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 Indicators. 51-80% of Stakeholders are engaged in the development and operation of an appropriate accountability assessment system.</p>	<p>LEVEL 3 Indicators. 81-100% of School community stakeholders continuously and collaboratively review and enhance accountability systems' processes, mechanisms and tools.</p>	<p>SMEA/M&E Report</p> <p>Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMEA/M&E Committee • TORs/Roles and Responsibilities <p>Tool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMEA/M&E Tool • Accomplished SMEA/M&E Tool <p>Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manual/Online Collection/Gathering of Data • Processing of Data (Presentation, interpretation and analysis of data) • Communication of Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers -Parents -Learners -Other external stakeholders • Utilization of Data <p>MOVs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SMEA/M&E Committee Members with TORs 2. School Memo on the Designation of Committee Members 3. SMEA/M&E Template and Tool 4. School Memo on the Implementation of SMEA/M&E 5. Gathered and consolidated SMEA/M&E Report 6. Interpreted, analyzed and presented SMEA/M&E Report with the Stakeholders (teachers, learners, parents and other external stakeholders) with Activity Report (narrative, attendance, pictorials and

					<p>communications)</p> <p>7. List of identified gaps on the SMEA/M&E report and the action taken</p> <p>Level 1 – MOVs 1, 2, 3 and 4 are present</p> <p>Level 2 – MOVs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 present</p> <p>Level 3 – All MOVs are present</p>	
<p>4. Accountability assessment criteria and tools, feedback mechanisms, and information collection and validation techniques and processes are inclusive and collaboratively developed and agreed upon.</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>LEVEL 1 Indicators. The school, with the participation 50% of stakeholders articulates an accountability assessment framework with basic components, including implementation guidelines.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 Indicators. 51-80% Stakeholders are engaged in the development and operation of an appropriate accountability assessment system.</p>	<p>LEVEL 3 Indicators. 81-100%Stakeholders continuously and collaboratively review and enhance accountability systems; processes, mechanism and tools.</p>	<p>Feedback Mechanism/ Accountability Assessment System</p> <p>Assessment Tool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Client Satisfaction Survey ▪ Parent's Opinionnaire ▪ Checklist Form ▪ Survey Questionnaire ▪ Tracer Study Tool <p>Information Collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sampling ▪ Suggestion Box ▪ Documentation ▪ Conduct of Survey <p>Mode</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manual ▪ Online <p>MOV's:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessment Tool 2. Administer the assessment tool 3. Gathered and consolidated feedback from parents, learners, and other external stakeholders 4. Interpreted, analyzed and presented 	

					feedback 5. Action Taken with accomplishment report Level 1 – MOVs 1 and 2 are present Level 2 – MOVs 1, 2 and 3 are present Level 3 – All MOVs are present	
5. Participatory assessment of performance is done regularly with the community. Assessment results and lessons learned serve a basis for feedback, technical assistance, recognition and plan adjustment.	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	Level 1 Indicators. The school initiates periodic performance assessment with the participation of 50% stakeholders.	Level 2 Indicators. Collaboratively conduct of performance assessment informs planning, plan adjustments and requirements for technical assistance with 51-80% stakeholders participation.	Level 3 Indicators. School-community-developed performance assessment is practiced and is the basis for improving monitoring and evaluation system, providing technical assistance, and recognizing and refining plans with 81-100% stakeholders participation.	MOVs: 1. Assessment of SMEA/MGE Consolidated Reports 2. Status report on the Implementation of PPAs 3. Adjusted ESIP/AIP/BE-LCP/WFP 4. Plan adjustment report presented with the stakeholders (teachers, learners, parents, and other external stakeholders) with Activity Report (narrative, attendance, pictorials and communications) 5. Accomplished TA agreement form between the PSDS and School Head on the implementation of the PPAs Level 1 – MOV 1 is present Level 2 – MOVs 1, 2 and 3 are present Level 3 – All MOVs are present	

Total _____
 Weighted Mean _____
 Weighted Percentage 20%

III. ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Findings:

Recommendations:

Best Features:

SCORE:

Reviewed By:

Approved by:

= Total Score =
5

SBM Principle Leader

SBM Coordinator

IV. MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

Resources are collectively and judiciously mobilized and managed with transparency, effectiveness, and efficiency.

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES	LEVEL OF PRACTICE				Standard MOVs	Actual MOVs
<p>1. Regular resource inventory is collaboratively undertaken by learning managers, learning facilitators, and community stakeholders as basis for resource allocation and mobilization.</p>	<p>LEVEL 0 Not Evident</p>	<p>LEVEL 1 Indicator 50% of Stakeholders are aware that a regular resource inventory is available and is used as the basis for resource allocation and mobilization.</p>	<p>LEVEL 2 Indicator Resource inventory is characterized by regularity, with 51-80% of participation of stakeholders, and communicated to the community as the basis for resource allocation and mobilization.</p>	<p>LEVEL 3 Indicator Resource inventories are systematically developed and with 81-100% stakeholders engagement in a collaborative process to make decisions on resource allocation and mobilization.</p>	<p>Human Resources Stakeholders <u>Internal Stakeholders</u> 1. School Head 2. Parents 3. Teachers 4. Learners <u>External Stakeholders</u> 1. LGUs 2. NGOs 3. Other sponsors/Donors Non-Human Resources Fiscal MOOE, PTA, LGUs, (Educ. funds) Donations Physical/ Material (Learning Materials, School Facilities, Buildings)</p>	
	<p>MOVs</p>	<p>SIP Crafting Memo Activity Report Attendance of the persons involved SOB/WFP/MDP /Resource Inventory a. Attendance b. Deed of Donations/Acceptance/MOU/MOA/partnership proposals</p>	<p>SIP Crafting Memo Activity Report Attendance of the persons involved SOB/WFP/MDP /Resource Inventory a. Attendance b. Deed of Donations/Acceptance/MOU/MOA/partnership proposals Stakeholders Report (Feedback) 1. Stakeholders</p>	<p>SIP Crafting Memo Activity Report Attendance of the persons involved SOB/WFP/MDP /Resource Inventory a. Attendance b. Deed of Donations/Acceptance/MOU/MOA/partnership proposals Stakeholders Report (Feedback) 1. Regular Meeting</p>	<p>Evidences 1. BE-LCP, AIP, SOB, WFP, Resource Inventory 2. BE/ASP RELATED DOCUMENTS a. Attendance b. Deed of Donations/Acceptance/MOU/MOA/partnership proposals c. Sustained/ established partners. d. Stakeholders Report (Feedback)</p>	

			Day/Hour a. Memo/ Announcement b. Activity Report Attendance during the Reporting	a. Memo b. Activity Report/ Minutes of the meeting <u>Sustained/established partners.</u> MOU/MOA/partnership proposals		
2. A regular dialogue for planning and resource programming, that is accessible and inclusive, continuously engage stakeholders and support implementation of community education plans.	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	LEVEL 1 Indicator 50% Stakeholders participation in the development of an educational plan in resource programming and in the implementation of the educational plan.	LEVEL 2 Indicator 51-80% Stakeholders are regularly engaged in the planning and resource programming and in the implementation of the educational plan.	LEVEL 3 Indicator 81-100% Stakeholders collaborate to ensure timely and need-based planning and resource programming and support continuous implementation of the educational plan.	1. BE-LCP, AIP, SOB, WFP, Resource Inventory 2. BE/ASP RELATED DOCUMENTS a. Attendance b. Deed of Donations/Acceptance/MOU/MOA/partnership proposals c. Sustained/established partners. d. Stakeholders Report (Feedback)	
	MOVs	Quarterly Meeting with Stakeholders (Memo/ Online announcement, attendance, minutes, activity report) General Assembly Memo/ Online announcement, attendance, minutes, activity report)	Quarterly Meeting with Stakeholders (Memo/ Online announcement, attendance, minutes, activity report) General Assembly Memo/ Online announcement, attendance, minutes, activity report)	Quarterly Meeting with Stakeholders (Memo/ Online announcement, attendance, minutes, activity report) Regular Project Monitoring Report and Analysis General Assembly Memo/ Online announcement, attendance, minutes, activity report)		

3. In place is a community-developed resource management system that drives appropriate behaviors of the stakeholders to ensure judicious, appropriate, and effective use of resources.	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	LEVEL 1 Indicator 50 % of Stakeholders support judicious, appropriate, and effective use of resources.	LEVEL 2 Indicator 51-80% of Stakeholders are engaged and share expertise in the collaborative development of resource management system.	LEVEL 3 Indicator 81-100% of Stakeholders sustain the implementation and improvement of a collaboratively developed, periodically adjusted, and constituent-focused resource management system.	Project Monitoring Report and Analysis Quarterly Meeting with Stakeholders (Memo/ Online announcement, attendance, minutes, activity report) General Assembly Memo/ Online announcement, attendance, minutes, activity report)	
	MOVs	BE-LCP/AIP/SOB/ Financial statement/MODE liquidation report	BE-LCP/AIP/SOB/ Financial statement/MODE liquidation report Meetings of PTA, Faculty Club SSG/SPG/SGC/LGUs/NGOs and other stakeholders/SBAC - Letter - Minutes - Attendance	BE-LCP/AIP/SOB/ Financial statement/ Monthly MODE liquidation reports/ Resource Generated Report Internal/External Meetings and Report about School resource management system AIP Adjustment (Memo/ Announcement/ Activity Report and attendance SMEA		
4. Regular monitoring, evaluation, and reporting processes of resource management are collaboratively	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	LEVEL 1 Indicator 50% of Stakeholders are invited to participate in the development and implementation of	LEVEL 2 Indicator 51-80% of Stakeholders collaboratively participate in the development and	LEVEL 3 Indicator 81-100% of Stakeholders are engaged, held and accountable and implement a	BE-LCP/AIP/SOB/ Financial statement/MODE liquidation report Internal/External Meetings and Report SMEA	

developed and implemented by the learning managers, facilitators and community stakeholders.		monitoring, evaluation and reporting processes on resource management.	implementation of monitoring, evaluation and reporting resource management.	collaboratively developed a system of monitoring, evaluation and reporting resource management.		
	MOVs	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting mechanism of resource management 1. Letter of invitation to stakeholders, 2. Attendance – 50% /Logbook Activity report	a. Letter of invitation b. Program c. Attendance- 51%-80%. d. Accomplishment Report Activity Evaluation	a. Letter of invitation b. Program c. Attendance- 81%-100%. d. Accomplishment Report e. Activity Evaluation f. Agreement Report g. Oath taking Feedback mechanism to/from		
5. There is a system that manages the network and linkages which strengthen and sustain partnerships for improving resource management.	LEVEL 0 Not Evident	LEVEL1 Indicator An engagement procedure to identify and utilize partnerships with 50% stakeholders for improving resource management is evident.	LEVEL2 Indicator 51-80% Stakeholders support a system of partnerships for improving resource management.	LEVEL3 Indicator An established system of partnership is managed and sustained by 81-100% stakeholders for continuous improvement of resource management.	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting mechanism of resource management Feedback mechanism to stakeholders Inventory of stakeholders BE-LCP/ASP related documents (i.e., MOU/MOA/Partnership/Deed of donation/acceptance/proposals/Recognition)	

	MOVs	Inventory of Internal and external stakeholders Partnership proposals Presentation of Package of support/Projects Menu/priority needs of the school Deed of Donation/Acceptance/MOU /MOA 50% stakeholder's partnership (baseline last year data)	Inventory of Internal and external stakeholders Partnership proposals Presentation of Package of support/Projects Menu/priority needs of the school Deed of Donation/Acceptance/MOU /MOA 51%-81% stakeholder's partnership (baseline last year data) Partnership proposals	Inventory of Internal and external stakeholders Partnership proposals Presentation of Package of support/Projects Menu/priority needs of the school Deed of Donation/Acceptance/MOU /MOA 81%-100% stakeholder's partnership Program to establish sustainable partnership Awards and Recognition system to Stakeholders Feedback mechanism (Report on the impact of the improved management system)	Periodic status Report and Evaluation Program to establish sustainable partnership Awards and Recognition system to Stakeholders Feedback mechanism (Report on the impact of the improved resource management system)	
--	-------------	--	---	---	--	--

Total _____
Weighted Mean _____
Weighted Percentage 15%

IV. MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

Findings:

Recommendations:

Best Features:

SCORE:

Reviewed By:

Approved by:

= Total Score =
5

SBM Principle Leader

SBM Coordinator

Principle of SBM Practice	Percentage Weight
Leadership and Governance	25%
Curriculum and Instruction	40%
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	20%
Management of Resources	15%

Numerical Rating Scale	Description
0	No evidence
1	Evidence indicates developing structures and mechanisms are in place to demonstrate ACCESs
2	Evidence indicates planned practices and procedures are fully implemented and aligned to ACCESs
3	Evidence indicates practices and procedures satisfy quality standards

Compute the scores by principle following the formula below: Total Score/Points x weighted percentage allotted to each principle:

<p>Principle 1: Leadership and Governance (25) Total Score: 9 No. of Indicators: 5 Weighted Percentage 25% $9/5 \times .25 = .45$ points earned for Leadership and Governance</p>	<p>Principle 3: Accountability and Continuous Improvement (20) Total Score: 9 No. of Indicators: 5 Weighted Percentage 20% $9/5 \times .20 = .36$ points earned for Accountability and Continuous Improvement</p>
<p>Principle 2: Curriculum and Instruction (40) Total Score: 12 No. of Indicators: 7 Weighted Percentage 10% $12/7 \times .10 = 0.17$ (OOD) $3 \times .10 = 0.30$ (Filipino Reading) $1 \times .10 = 0.10$ (English Reading) $2 \times .10 = 0.20$ (Numeracy) $0.17 + 0.30 + 0.10 + 0.20 = .77$ points earned for Curriculum and Instruction</p>	<p>Principle 4: Management of Resources (15) Total Score: 10 No. of Indicators: 5 Weighted Percentage 25% $10/5 \times .15 = .3$ points earned for Management of Resources</p>

Below is the sample result of the final rating:

Areas	Weight	% weight	Numerical Rating	Descriptive Rating
A. SBM Assessment Score (DOD) and Intermediate Learning Outcomes	Leadership and Governance (25)	<u>.45</u>	1.88	Maturing
	Curriculum and Instruction (40)	<u>.77</u>		
	Accountability and Continuous Improvement (20)	<u>.36</u>		
	Management of Resources (15)	<u>.30</u>		
	Total 100%			
TOTAL	100%	FINAL RATING	1.88	Maturing

Numerical Rating Scale	Description
0.50 - 1.49	Developing
1.50 - 2.49	Maturing
2.50 - 3.0	Advanced

Prepared by:

PRINCIPAL

Reviewed by:

PSDS