



**INSTITUTIONALIZED ACCREDITATION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN THE CALABARZON AREA**

**Dr. Nerrie E. Malaluan and Lucia F. Tolentino**

Batangas State University, College of Teacher Education Rizal Avenue Batangas City, Philippines

**ARTICLE INFO**

**Article History:**

Received 10<sup>th</sup> February, 2019

Received in revised form 2<sup>nd</sup>

March, 2019

Accepted 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2019

Published online 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2019

**Key words:**

Institutionalized Accreditation; Leadership and Governance; Curriculum and Learning; Accountability and Continuous Improvement; Resource Management

**ABSTRACT**

Accreditation is a quality assurance tool to ensure delivery of service among organizations. Elementary schools as early ladders in education have to provide the beginning learners quality education, this, by participating in accreditation.

The study assessed the performance level of public elementary schools and their extent of participation in the institutionalized accreditation. Further, this study determined the assessment of accreditors on central schools with respect to the areas of leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement and resource management.

The descriptive method of research was utilized in the study with the use of a questionnaire as main data gathering instrument supplemented by informal interview and documentary analysis. Respondents of the study were 56 school heads and 333 teachers from public elementary schools in the CALABARZON (Calamba, Laguna, Batangas, Rizal and Quezon) area. The statistical tools used were weighted mean and t-test.

Results of the study revealed that the performance of public elementary schools in terms of pupils', curriculum, instruction, physical facilities and teachers' development was very satisfactory. Public elementary schools were found to participate in institutionalized accreditation to a great extent. The assessment of the accreditors showed that central schools had better ratings in all areas such as leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement and resource management with the highest rating obtained in the area of leadership and governance.

Copyright©2019 Dr. Nerrie E. Malaluan and Lucia F. Tolentino. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**INTRODUCTION**

Excellence is based on the quality and relevance of education and how schools ensure that graduates have knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed. The changing nature of work environments, the emergence of technology-driven processes, and the diversified needs of learners are challenging the ability of schools to meet the demands for the 21st century system of education. This means having education as avenue for poverty alleviation which is one of the current worst problems not only in the Philippines, but even in the developing countries of the world as well. Consequently, it is apt to improve the quality of education at all levels as what the educational organizations and authorities are doing nowadays by implementing varied programs and infusing further innovations. In the Philippines, the most recent innovation is the implementation of K to 12 curriculum program. The aforesaid implementation transforms the previous 10 - year basic education to 12 years from Grades 1 to 12 and brings reforms in the educational system.

The implementation of the current curriculum posed a great challenge to the school authorities and the community.

*\*Corresponding author:* **Dr. Nerrie E. Malaluan**  
Batangas State University, College of Teacher Education Rizal Avenue Batangas City, Philippines

This challenge has to be met by stakeholders to enable them to realize the shared goals and objectives in the educational system. This requires strong linkage, cooperation and partnership between the school and the community through the implementation of Philippine Accreditation System for Basic Education (PASBE). The PASBE aims to accredit schools to improve further the quality of education. It is in this connection that School Based Management (SBM) is deemed instrumental to empower the school and the community as a key component of Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA).

DepEd Order No. 83 series of 2012, articulated PASBE accreditation is a certification process that looks into the essential areas of school operations to conform to quality standards established through a consensus of stakeholders of basic education. Responsibility and decision-making over different types of school operations are transferred to individuals at the school level, who in turn must conform within a set of centrally or state-level determined policies<sup>[1]</sup>.

Evidently, the school cannot thrive alone by itself but needs partnership with stakeholders. The school-parent-community partnership is a continuous planning, participation, and evaluation of activities that enhance the success of students. It

recognizes that students' education is a joint responsibility shared by schools and parents as part of the larger community, and that these participants directly impact learning. Schools must, in cooperation with their constituencies, create an atmosphere of collaboration, mutual acceptance, and commonality of goals in order to foster the educational success of all children. Schools should incorporate strategies towards continuous improvement and achievement of plans.

In the implementation of SBM in the Philippines, the DepEd aims to create an environment where all stakeholders involved in the process do not only agree, but also commit to make change happen under a decentralized set up. For this endeavor to succeed, teachers and principals need to develop people's skills and managerial capabilities. The DepEd is pursuing a package of policy reforms for school heads through the BESRA, among others; to strengthen partnership with communities as well as local government units to invest time, money and effort in making the school a better place for learning and integrate school management and instructional reform for greater effectiveness.

To further strengthen the SBM practice, the DepEd embarked on revisiting the SBM framework, assessment process and tool to improve on already recognized SBM practices. DepEd reemphasizes the centrality of the learners and the involvement of relevant community basic education service delivery. This serves as the venue to introduce the harmonized PASBE as an integrated component of SBM Practice. SBM-PASBE will serve as a vehicle to institute reforms with the help of the community.

With the community's help anchored on the schools' quest for global competitiveness, public elementary schools have to undergo a process of continuous improvement to keep abreast with the current needs and demands of society, the government and the work environment. This poses a need to continuously look at the performance of schools, not only from the perspective of teachers, students and school heads but more importantly, from that of the stakeholders; thus, involving the school community in the school evaluation of its own performance.

School performance evaluation can be facilitated in many different ways using different instruments. Some of these instruments are interviews, social outcomes survey, state/agency evaluation system, or school-based evaluation tool. Furthermore, this may consist of very simple focus open-ended questions requiring short narratives from respondents to survey questionnaires that contain items which cover different dimensions or key indicators. Opinion surveys gauge stakeholders' satisfaction with important aspects of public school education but if schools need a more objective picture to assess performance, they need to use tools other than opinion surveys alone. School surveys aim to provide schools with indicators to help them reflect on the outcomes of their practices and to address any concerns identified. Survey results can also provide schools with information needed in their preparation or crafting of further plans.

Crafting further plans begins from School Based Management implementation under the leadership of the school head, whereas each school together with its community stakeholders (PTCA, LGU, barangays, teachers, student leaders, alumni and other interested organizations), should prepare a situation analysis of the school, based on actual baseline data. A good

source of comprehensive data is the school annual report of the preceding school year.

Evaluation is an important control instrument in all activities, especially in goal-oriented and decentralized educational system, where a clear feedback both to decision-makers and to individuals in the operative performance is required. There are a number of different models and strategies in the evaluation of public school performance, some of which models evaluate products and others processes. For Jokela<sup>[2]</sup>, depending on which type of evaluation model is used, the possibilities of different interested parties to have their needs and interests elucidated and noticed are affected. Whatever models are used, evaluations focus more on models and methods than on frequently used or applied set of criteria.

According to Kane and Mitchell<sup>[3]</sup>, posited assessment or evaluation of public school performance is not an entirely new assessment strategy. Proponents of public school performance assessments view assessments themselves as the lever for systemic curricular and instructional reforms at any level of the educational hierarchy. This systematic strategy of public education reform is due to several reasons: to check on effectiveness of systems of marking to determine which constructivist model of learning is effective and find reasons for the non-readiness of graduates and their incompetence to enter the workplace.

Institutionalizing the evaluation of public school performance brings new challenges to the current policy and systems management, and the responses to which must be compatible with the new demands of time. Evaluating the performance of public schools may show the new demands of the current period and how the present system brings effective and continuous improvement of the educational system. With evaluation there will be common criteria to be used. Evaluation may also monitor the outcomes of education system and maximize the use of evaluation information.

In view of continuous improvement of the educational system, Ruggiero<sup>[4]</sup> developed and discussed certain models suitable for the evaluation of performance of the public education sector. He posited that the evaluation of performance of public educational services was a concern in the academic and policy arenas and of utmost importance considering the amount of financial and materials resources devoted to the evaluation of public school performance activity. Given these recent concerns, the evaluation of the performance of public education sector was natural and indeed a necessity.

In addition to the idea aforesaid, the effect of evaluation on school performance was discussed by Taylor & Tyler<sup>[5]</sup> which according to them was traditionally studied in context. Evaluation of school performance was characterized as an investment in the evaluated entity or agency. School performance varied substantially and evaluation itself was increasingly a focus of public policy proposals. Furthermore, a quality evaluation measure could improve the performance consistent with the traditional predictions; and in subsequent years, consistent with what had been invested. However, the estimated improvements during evaluation of school performance were less precise. Additionally, the effects represented a substantial gain in welfare given the purpose of evaluation.

For instructional delivery, Grauwe and Naidoo<sup>[6]</sup> stated that the evaluation of school effectiveness and performance are measured by looking at the learners' access or participation; ability for retention; learners completing the requirements; and learners' achievement.

Generally, according to Diabré<sup>[7]</sup> monitoring and evaluation of school performance enhance the schools' effectiveness by looking at the past and present performance of the school and solutions to resolve weaknesses. This kind of evaluation requires intensive reorientation and planning. Without monitoring and evaluation of school performance, it would be impossible to judge if the work of schools is going in the right direction, whether progress and success could be claimed, and how future efforts may be improved.

Accreditation of public elementary schools is a quality assurance method. Through the accreditation process, schools are monitored and checked if they are meeting required quality standards in all areas of their work: academic programs, teacher support, student services and more. Accreditation in the Philippines like the Philippine Accreditation System for Basic Education (PASBE) aims at accrediting schools to improve the quality of education. School Based Management (SBM) was deemed instrumental to empower the school and the community as a key component of BESRA.

Arcelo<sup>[8]</sup>, cites accreditation of public elementary schools is a quality management mechanism for institutions and programs and verified by the Department of Education (DepEd). Generally, in whatever area, accreditation is for quality assurance in the Philippine education system. The importance of providing and maintaining a continuous mechanism to raise academic standards was achieved in terms of the establishment of accreditation system in the Philippines. Graduates from accredited schools has greater chances and opportunities for employment as they are believed to have been shaped to make meaningful contributions to the world of work.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study made use of descriptive research design with the use of questionnaire as the main data gathering instrument complemented by documentary analysis and interview to gather more information pertinent to the study. The respondents of the study were the 56 school heads and 333 teachers from public elementary schools. Purposive sampling was used to determine the number of respondents for school heads. Meanwhile, scientific sampling using Slovin's formula at five percent margin of error was utilized to determine the teacher-respondents. Weighted mean and t-test were the statistical tools utilized in this study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Teachers Performance Level of Public Elementary Schools

Elementary schools are considered as second home to children, thus they must be very supportive so that children will develop holistically. This part presents the assessment of the respondents on the performance level attained by the schools.

Pupils' development. The process of optimizing the academic performance of the pupils through the improvement of the schools is deemed highly necessary. Table 2 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers in the performance

level of public elementary schools in terms of pupils' development.

**Table 2** Performance Level in Terms of Pupils' Development

Items	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	VI	WM	VI
1.provides pupils up-to-date instructional tools and equipment	4.36	VS	4.15	VS
2.gives pupils remedial classes in all learning areas	4.34	VS	4.17	VS
3.treats pupils fairly and inside and outside the school	4.54	O	4.44	VS
4.uses collaborative or cooperative learning activities to improve capacities of learners for higher learning	4.54	O	4.30	VS
5.introduces physical exercise to have healthy body	4.48	VS	4.31	VS
6.taps or recognizes pupils potentials and talents	4.64	O	4.30	VS
7.motivates pupils to join contests and competitions	4.68	O	4.32	VS
8.gives rewards and due recognition to the deserving pupils	4.61	O	4.33	VS
9.provides learning workshops/lecture for moral recovery	4.41	VS	4.11	VS
10.conducts regular meeting with parents in connection with their progress	4.55	O	4.31	VS
11.addresses individual differences	4.36	VS	4.23	VS
12.handles behavior problems quickly and with due respect to children's rights	4.41	VS	4.26	VS
13.provides conducive classroom for healthy learning environment	4.45	VS	4.32	VS
14.conducts schools' academic and sports competitions	4.46	VS	4.27	VS
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>VS</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>VS</b>

Legend: WM – Weighted Mean O – Outstanding  
VI – Verbal Interpretation VS – Very Satisfactory

As shown in the table, school heads assessed that public elementary schools were outstanding in motivating pupils to join contests and competitions which obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.68. This implies that the schools recognize the importance of providing pupils different avenues to improve their skills and talents. It can be said that schools are fond of organizing curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities to cater the different interest of the learners. Through these activities, pupils get motivated to join, and thus, develop their potentials and sportsmanship.

This was followed closely by the assessment of the school heads that schools were also outstanding in tapping or recognizing pupils' potentials and talents which obtained a weighted mean of 4.64. This could be for the reason that they can recognize the big role elementary schools play in the development of learners. It is a known fact that learners in the elementary school are in their foundation years that's why their experiences in school matter so much to their development. Through tapping the talents and potentials of learners they are able to build their self-confidence, discover their strengths, overcome their weaknesses and develop a sense of self-esteem. This relates with the concept of Arcelo<sup>[8]</sup> that products of accredited schools who may be exposed to holistic learning and conducive environment would become capable of making meaningful contributions to the world of work.

Lastly, school heads assessed that schools were very satisfactory in providing remedial classes in all learning areas with a weighted mean of 4.34. Giving remedial classes in elementary education has always been a regular practice of teachers so that pupils who are found to be having difficulty may be given intervention or that if pupils are found to be performing not so well in one topic or subject for instance, they can be given reinforcement. However, according to school heads in the interview conducted by the researcher, this is sometimes very challenging on the part of the teachers because of time constraint and bulk of work that must be simultaneously performed. This holds true to the criteria of the Assessment, Standards, Strategies, and Accountability (ASSA) model provided by DepEd which emphasized on the students' appropriate assessment, achievement and performance as well as the implementation of strategies that directly address learning problems.

Generally, school heads assessed that public elementary schools' performance with respect to pupils' development was very satisfactory as evidenced in the composite mean of 4.49. This indicates that schools had high regard to pupils as they have always considered pupils as the heart of the school, the curriculum and the teaching-learning process.

Shifting to teachers' assessment about the performance of elementary schools relative to pupils' development, teachers gave their highest assessment of very satisfactory to treating pupils fairly inside and outside the school as shown in the weighted mean of 4.44. This could be because foremost among the roles of teacher besides being an instructor is also a second parent and in being a second parent teachers are expected to be giving fair treatment to everyone.

Having a weighted mean of 4.33, the teachers assessed that schools were very satisfactory in giving rewards and recognition to deserving pupils. This implies that teachers had a deep realization and understanding of the importance or recognizing pupils' achievements. Teachers could have probably thought that the reason why it was important for pupils to be recognized or rewarded was that it helped pupils realized what they were capable of doing. Recognition and giving of rewards must have also served as feedback mechanism to tell pupils that good performance leads to good outcomes.

Lastly, providing learning workshops/lecture for moral recovery garnered the lowest weighted mean of 4.11, though still rated very satisfactorily by teachers. This implies that though schools were already very satisfactory in this aspect, this still needs some sort of reinforcement. Normally, moral recovery trainings are given only to high school students and those in elementary are only counselled when they misbehave.

Teachers' assessment obtained a composite mean of 4.27 indicating that based on teachers' assessment schools had a very satisfactory performance in terms of pupils' development. Notably, this ran parallel with that of school heads' assessment, therefore, it can be said that public elementary schools are really doing their best to develop the knowledge, skills and potentials of each and every learner. However, there are still rooms for improvement so that schools may be able to soar high as an instrument of change.

Curriculum development. Curriculum is considered as the total learning experiences of the learners, thus this curriculum must

be continuously developed to address the needs of the learners and the needs of time. Presented in Table 3 is the assessment of school heads and teachers in the performance level of public schools in terms of curriculum development.

**Table 3** Performance Level in Terms of Curriculum Development

Items	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. adopts changes like the K to 12 program	4.63	O	4.48	VS
2. uses the new grading system	4.70	O	4.55	O
3. integrates/utilizes ICT in the teaching-learning process	4.56	O	4.35	VS
4. produces up-to-date instructional materials/teaching aids	4.46	VS	4.24	VS
5. implements programs to address performance discrepancies	4.36	VS	4.15	VS
6. adopts local beliefs, norms, values, traditions, folklores, current events and existing technologies	4.41	VS	4.22	VS
7.promotes localization and indigenization of materials in the teaching-learning process	4.45	VS	4.21	VS
8. uses the community as learning laboratory	4.34	VS	4.01	VS
9. invites representative from the community stakeholders to assess contents and methods used in learning	4.27	VS	4.01	VS
10. prioritizes learners' rights in designing strategies and approaches in the teaching-learning process	4.39	VS	4.20	VS
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.46</b>	<b>VS</b>	<b>4.24</b>	<b>VS</b>

Legend: WM – Weighted Mean O – Outstanding  
VI – Verbal Interpretation VS – Very Satisfactory

Relative to school heads' assessment in terms of curriculum development, public elementary schools were considered outstanding in using the new grading system shown in the highest weighted mean of 4.70. Since the implementation of K-12 program, many have changed in the education system, school heads had to implement as well some changes in the way learners will be graded. These are contrary to Macha *et al's*<sup>[9]</sup> findings that participation and achievement rates had fallen dramatically and that poor performance of Filipino students are reflected in assessment test results especially in Math and Science.

Given as well an assessment of outstanding was evidently shown in the weighted mean of 4.63 was on adopting changes like the k-12 program. This implies that public elementary schools are open to changes and obedient in following Dep Ed policies for nation-wide reform and improvement in education. In addition, school heads and teachers are also given budget to attend seminars, workshops and trainings so they can effectively implement in their own respective schools the changes in the education system.

Obtaining the lowest weighted mean of 4.27 interpreted as very satisfactory was inviting representatives from the community stakeholders to assess contents and methods used in learning. This implies that public elementary schools have external examiners of their curriculum. This is a good practice because stakeholders from the community can provide realistic inputs for curricular improvement. As such, curriculum becomes more relevant and responsive. However, school heads could have probably seen as well the need for more intellectual undertakings geared towards curriculum assessment with the presence of some more community stakeholders to ensure quality delivery of learning. According to Hasbun& Rudolph<sup>[10]</sup>, it is imperative through accreditation that external

review as well as internal analysis be put to good use to provide invaluable feedback on how an effective curriculum and school improvement might be achieved.

Generally, school heads assessed public elementary schools as very satisfactory in their performance with respect to curriculum development as revealed in the composite mean of 4.46. This implies that public elementary schools keep in touch with curriculum innovations to make their learners at par with the rest of the pupils in other elementary schools in the country. This is also a good indication of good instructional management of school heads that despite the many activities they have to attend to, they do not neglect their primordial function as curriculum managers of their respective schools.

Meanwhile, lowest rated among the indicators with the same weighted mean of 4.01, indicating that schools were very satisfactory, were using the community as learning laboratory and inviting representatives from the community stakeholders to assess contents and methods used in learning. This could be because despite community stakeholders participate by serving as learning resources and learning evaluators, participation is sometimes hard to invite because of their busy schedule.

Summarizing teachers' assessment about elementary schools' performance in terms of curriculum development, it can be said that schools had performed very satisfactorily as revealed in the composite mean of 4.24. This implies that teachers observed that schools take actions to provide pupils learning experiences that can hone their potentials. Curriculum, after all, must be understood as the total learning experiences of the child that's why this is widely encompassing. Teachers could have probably seen that schools exerted efforts to make every dimension of the curriculum supportive of the learners.

Instructional development. Since learners are changing and the society they are living in also keeps on changing, it is but imperative for instruction to keep abreast with trends and updates about the teaching-learning process. Table 4 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the performance of public elementary schools in terms of instructional development.

**Table 4** Performance Level in Terms of Instructional Development

Items	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. monitors regularly the teaching-learning process	4.49	VS	4.31	VS
2. provides instructional materials like cd, video tapes and other manipulative objects	4.46	VS	4.11	VS
3. sends teachers to in-service trainings/seminar workshop to enhance teaching capabilities	4.57	O	4.26	VS
4. utilizes master teachers to assist and guide new teachers in rendering classroom instruction	4.52	O	4.23	VS
5. improves and enhances teaching-learning process by employing community resources and effective public relations	4.46	VS	4.15	VS
6. provides due recognition and incentives for teachers to grow professionally in practice and in performance	4.43	VS	3.99	VS
7. encourages 100 percent pupils participation in classroom activities	4.54	O	4.29	VS
8. evaluates learning outcomes periodically	4.63	O	4.35	VS
9. takes advantage of the adopt-a-school program for the attainment of some equipment for instruction purposes like television sets	4.39	VS	4.23	VS
10. allows peer tutoring	4.41	VS	4.20	VS

**Composite Mean** 4.49 VS 4.21 VS

Legend: WM – Weighted Mean O – Outstanding

VI – Verbal Interpretation VS – Very Satisfactory

As reflected in the table regarding school heads' assessment in the schools' performance in terms of instructional development, public elementary schools were outstanding in evaluating learning outcomes periodically as proven in the highest weighted mean of 4.63. This implies that the schools were eager to determine the development of every pupil's dynamic learning and academic capacity. This holds true to the idea of Grauwe and Naidoo<sup>[6]</sup> who acknowledged that it is important that learners display readiness and competency in their grades and achievement tests.

All things considered, based on the school heads' assessment, the performance level of the public schools relative to instructional development was very satisfactory as evidenced by the composite mean of 4.59. Certainly, instructional development is necessary to ensure that learners get the best quality education they all deserve. Hence, a good performance in instructional development is an indicators of efficient and effective delivery of education services.

Moving on to the teachers' assessment on the performance of public elementary schools regarding instructional development, the teachers assessed that the schools were very satisfactory in evaluating learning outcomes periodically as reflected in the highest weighted mean of 4.35. This indicates that the teachers gave emphasis on the importance of determining the level of the pupils' acquisition of learning in order to address the difficulties they encounter. Evaluating learning outcomes periodically may help teachers identify areas for improvement to ensure learning efficiency.

Similarly, teachers assessed the schools to be very satisfactory in monitoring regularly the teaching-learning process which obtained the weighted mean of 4.31. It shows that teachers play a crucial role in this aspect and that is to transmit new learning and knowledge into the minds of the pupils. By regularly monitoring the teaching-learning process, teachers may easily identify which factor mostly captures the students' interest to learn and what could be the main reason for its decline. Through such process, students become engaged in a more effective way of learning that makes them critical thinkers, creative and skillful.

Lastly, teachers assessed the schools as very satisfactory in providing due recognition and incentives for teachers to grow professionally in practice and in performance despite the fact that it obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.99. This could be that the schools appreciate the hard work of public elementary teachers although it was not given a very high regard. However, it can be said that public elementary schools are doing their best to give emphasis on giving recognition and incentives for teachers to grow professionally in all aspects.

All in all, based on the teachers' assessment, the public elementary schools' performance with respect to instructional development was very satisfactory as indicated in the composite mean of 4.21. This implies that schools emphasized utmost importance on instructional development, considering it as the most crucial component of teaching. Instructional development serves as the basic foundation of students' way of acquiring knowledge and empowers them to adapt themselves according to the changing circumstances in the learning environment. And most importantly, instructional development

significantly contributes to the growth and advancement of learning amidst diverse classroom instructions and procedures. Physical development. One of the most important elements of a supportive learning environment is the physical resource; this is also considered as support materials. Without much of these, learning is affected. Presented in Table 5 is the assessment of school heads and teachers on the performance level of public elementary schools in terms of physical development.

**Table 5** Performance Level in Terms of Physical Development

Items	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. upgrades/improves school plant facilities	4.46	VS	4.19	VS
2. establishes ideal classroom as a home	4.46	VS	4.20	VS
3. repairs parts of classrooms or buildings for effective use	4.41	VS	4.13	VS
4. purchases tools/equipment for maintenance purposes of physical facilities	4.34	VS	4.08	VS
5. paints/repaints classrooms and surroundings to make it more conducive	4.39	VS	4.12	VS
6. develops plans and programs to enhance school plant facilities	4.38	VS	4.08	VS
7. solicits ideas from other stakeholders on how to improve school physical facilities	4.27	VS	4.09	VS
8. generates financial and material contributions for the improvement of physical facilities	4.34	VS	4.07	VS
9. links with other government agencies to seek financial assistance and material contributions for the establishment of additional school buildings	4.38	VS	4.11	VS
10. exercises transparency and ethical governance when it comes to procurement of materials or equipment for physical development	4.46	VS	4.16	VS
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.39</b>	<b>VS</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>VS</b>

Legend: WM – Weighted Mean O – Outstanding  
VI – Verbal Interpretation VS – Very Satisfactory

Table 5 shows that based on school heads’ assessment, schools were said to be very satisfactory in upgrading or improving school plant facilities, in establishing ideal classroom as a home and in exercising transparency and ethical governance when it comes to procurement of materials or equipment for physical development which obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.46. It proves to show that schools were very satisfactory in producing quality school services tantamount to varying needs of the members of the academe through making the continuous development of different facilities a top priority. Schools see to it that each of their members’ needs will not be left unattended.

Lastly, soliciting ideas from other stakeholders on how to improve school physical facilities garnered the lowest weighted mean of 4.27, though still rated very satisfactorily by school heads. This implies that schools fell short to consolidate suggestions and brainstorm ideas from other stakeholders about means, ways, and methods in improving school facilities. It also indicates that schools at some point in the perspective of school heads failed to become open to boundless opportunities negotiating with other stakeholders could possibly resulted. This relayed to the belief of Chaffee<sup>[11]</sup> that the effectiveness of district systems for support and intervention makes the accountability of the schools evident

and that districts can efficiently address the schools’ operational needs.

School heads’ assessment obtained a composite mean of 4.39 indicating that for them schools had a very satisfactory performance in terms of physical development. It could be safely inferred that public elementary schools continuously strive to improve school physical facilities to the best of their abilities. They find various ways on how to maintain good condition of these physical facilities to ensure the optimum utilization of those who will use it.

Meanwhile, teachers also assessed the performance of public elementary schools in relation to its physical development. Under this, teachers gave their highest assessment to establishing ideal classroom as a home as reflected in the weighted mean of 4.20. This indicates that the school is very satisfactory in creating an exemplary learning environment for the pupils by providing safe, pleasing and commendable study halls to elementary pupils. Furthermore, the teachers also acknowledged the effort of the schools in prioritizing the comfort and welfare of the elementary pupils by creating a favourable and positive learning environment that can give constructive influence to the learners. It is known that the physical appearance and organization of the classrooms can either positively or negatively affect the development of the learners especially their emotional, social and cognitive aspect, thus it is necessary to generate the best possible classrooms.

Generally, teachers assessed that public elementary schools’ performance in relation to its physical development is very satisfactory as evidently presented in the weighted mean of This implies that schools had always valued and prioritized the development of the facilities to provide the pupils the quality and favourable physical environment.

Teachers’ development. Teachers being the counterpart of learners also have to upgrade themselves and it is the responsibility of the school to inspire its teacher take actions for professional growth and development. Table 6 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the performance level of public elementary schools in terms of teachers’ development.

**Table 6** Performance Level in Terms of Teachers’ Development

Items	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. subscribes teacher’s magazines and journals to locate new ideas and procedures in teaching	3.93	VS	3.89	VS
2. motivates teachers to do better and work effectively	4.43	VS	4.21	VS
3. recommends teachers for career advancement or promotion	4.27	VS	4.22	VS
4. sends teachers to in-service training or seminar/workshop	4.43	VS	4.24	VS
5. encourages teachers to participate actively in community socio-civic and religious organizations	4.30	VS	4.16	VS
6. conducts School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) regularly to update teachers with some changes and innovations in the system	4.45	VS	4.24	VS
7. encourages teachers to attend post graduate program	4.38	VS	4.20	VS
8. conducts team building activities to harmonize relationship among teachers	4.36	VS	4.19	VS
9. gives due recognition and reward to the deserving teachers	4.36	VS	4.14	VS
10. encourages teachers to do school-based research like action research ad investigatory research	4.18	VS	4.10	VS
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>VS</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>VS</b>

Legend: WM – Weighted Mean O – Outstanding  
VI – Verbal Interpretation VS – Very Satisfactory

Examining school heads' assessment, it can be seen in the table that public elementary schools were very satisfactory in conducting School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) regularly to update teachers with some changes and innovations in the system which obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.45. It could be because this activity aims to make teachers constantly figure out new ways to engage students in their lesson. Through this, it will enhance teachers' knowledge, skills, and behaviour more.

In general, school heads assessed that public elementary schools' performance in terms of teacher's development was very satisfactory as reflected in the composite mean of 4.31. This shows that school heads always make sure to provide effective program and collaborate with the teachers to get and achieve high performance goals as teachers are considered the facilitators of learning in school setting.

Moving on to teachers' assessment with regards to the performance level of elementary schools with reference to teachers' development, the teachers assessed that schools were very satisfactory in sending teachers to in-service training or seminar/workshop obtaining a weighted mean of 4.24, the highest. This implies that development of teachers does not end on the time that they obtain their license. They need to outburst themselves professionally. In other words, teachers still need to be trained and undergo seminars/workshop in order to improve their skills, teaching styles and techniques.

In a general, based on the teachers' assessment, the performance level of public elementary schools with regards to teachers' development was very satisfactory as evidenced in the composite mean of 4.16. Still and all, this could be that the schools were really doing their best and all possible ways to further develop the teachers professionally, because highly educated and experienced teachers would reflect to the image, academic development and quality of education the school offers. It is a fact that schools are nothing without great teachers. However, teachers being very satisfied to the performance of the schools were an indication that they gained so much support, encouragement and motivation for their holistic development and success.

**Extent of Participation of Public Schools in the Institutionalized Accreditation**

Accreditation is indeed one of the most tedious school activities, thus schools should really strategize on how it can maximize all its resources to successfully pass this kind of quality assurance process. Table 7 presents the assessment of school heads and teachers on the extent of participation of public elementary schools in the institutionalized accreditation.

**Table 7** Participation of Public Elementary Schools in the Institutionalized Accreditation

Items	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	VI	WM	VI
1. applies voluntarily for accreditation	3.45	ME	3.09	ME
2. distributes copies of the accreditation guidelines and procedures among teachers and parents concern	3.21	ME	3.03	ME
3. prepares documentation report for each area	3.30	ME	3.09	ME
4. conducts regular meeting for updates regarding accreditation	3.29	ME	3.08	ME
5. benchmarks in other elementary	3.36	ME	2.94	ME

schools which have been accredited				
6. consults higher authorities for their suggestions and recommendations	3.38	ME	3.06	ME
7. assigns teachers to work on different areas	3.50	GE	3.20	ME
8. encourages other stakeholders like the parents to help in the accreditation process	3.36	ME	3.10	ME
9. requests teachers to work beyond eight hours to prepare for the documents needed in the accreditation	3.23	ME	3.08	ME
10. assigns a specific room for accreditation purposes	3.18	ME	3.02	ME
<b>Composite Mean</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>ME</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>ME</b>

Legend: WM – Weighted Mean VGE – Very Great Extent  
VI – Verbal Interpretation GE – Great Extent

As shown in Table 7, school heads assessed that to a great extent elementary schools assigned teachers to work on different areas, this garnered the highest weighted mean of 3.50. It is a known fact that accreditation is a tedious process that involves preparation of voluminous documents. Each area has to have sufficient support documents to convince the accreditors in giving good remarks about the school's performance. In so doing, teachers are assigned to different areas such as leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement and resource management.

Lastly, school heads assessed that, to a moderate extent, public elementary schools assigned a specific room for accreditation purpose garnering a weighted mean of 3.18, the lowest. This could be because one of the problems being encountered in basic education is insufficiency of facilities. Because of this, it is usually the office of the principal, the guidance office or sometimes the TLE room that are used for the purpose of accreditation. However, documents for accreditation are usually kept in the Office of the Principal.

Generally, the obtained composite mean in the assessment of school heads is 3.33 indicating that to a moderate extent public elementary schools participated in institutionalized accreditation. This could be because these schools knew that one of the means of improving the performance of the school is to subject it to accreditation. In addition, the responsibility of motivating and inspiring teachers to work for accreditation lies in the hands of the school heads. Since teachers already have a bulk of work, it takes an inspirational leader to make teachers work even beyond official hours.

Looking at teachers' assessment, it can be seen in Table 7 that for them their school assigns teachers to work on different areas, this also obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.20 with a verbal interpretation of to a moderate extent. Since the accreditation process covers various areas where the accreditors visit to check and evaluate, the teachers have to be designated to different areas to make the preparation easier and faster.

The garnered composite mean in the assessment of elementary teachers was 3.07 indicating that to a moderate extent public elementary schools participated in an institutionalized accreditation. This implies that schools knew that undergoing an accreditation process is significant in enhancing the quality of education provided by the schools. The success of the

accreditation also lies on the hands of teachers because they are usually the ones preparing the documents.

**Assessment of Accreditors on Central Schools**

To determine the assessment of accreditors on central schools, the researcher used documentary analysis. Results were all from the documents gathered by the researcher from the seven participating schools.

Leadership and Governance. It is true that a network of leadership and governance guides the education system to achieve its goals, making them responsive and context to the context of diverse environments. Table 9 presents data as results of documentary analysis regarding the assessment of accreditors on central schools in terms of leadership and governance.

**Table 9 Leadership and Governance**

Schools	Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1. School A	2.20	Better
2. School B	2.20	Better
3. School C	3.00	Best
4. School D	1.60	Better
5. School E	3.00	Best
6. School F	2.40	Better
7. School G	1.72	Better

Based on the documentary analysis conducted by the researcher to determine the assessment of accreditors on central schools, they found out that in terms of leadership and governance schools C and E got the highest assessment which both attained a rating of 3.00 interpreted as best. It could be because these schools were found by the accreditors to be having school improvement plan that is very much aligned with the school’s vision, mission and goals. Further, these schools did not only invite the participation of stakeholders but also made them full partners in the continual review of and improvement of the development plan. This is supported by Fernandez who cited that school improvement plan had become an integral part of many school reform efforts.

Also notable about these two schools as revealed in the documents examined by the researcher were that they provided network to collaboratively and continuously improve the school community. This network allowed easy exchange and access to information so that community stakeholders can also participate in decision making and problem solving. And lastly, they were also found to be best in having analysis of the competency and development needs of learners so that results of these analyses may be used for the development of long-term training and development program. This is in conformity to the concept of Diabré<sup>[7]</sup> which states that in order to enhance the schools’ effectiveness, linkages between past, present and future interventions and results, school performance should be consistently monitored and evaluated.

Curriculum and Learning. Curriculum is as dynamic as the changes in the society, same holds true with instruction, thus continuous monitoring and evaluation is highly necessary. Table 10 presents data as results of documentary analysis regarding the assessment of accreditors on central schools in terms of curriculum and learning.

**Table 10 Curriculum and Learning**

Schools	Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1. School A	2.60	Best
2. School B	2.30	Better
3. School C	3.00	Best
4. School D	2.28	Better
5. School E	2.80	Best
6. School F	1.90	Better
7. School G	0.44	Below Good

With respect to curriculum and learning, three central schools were rated best by the accreditors. These were school A with a rating of 2.60, school C with a rating of 3.00 and school E with a rating of 2.80. As revealed by the documents, these schools ensured that all types of learners in the school community were given appropriate programs and support materials. Another thing that was notable about these schools based on the documents analyzed was that these schools ensured that learning managers and facilitators nurture values and environment that are protective of children. They also had initiative to make stakeholders aware of child-centered, rights-based and inclusive principles of education. In addition, learners’ rights were also highly considered by these schools when they designed their curriculum.

Accountability and Continuous Improvement. A clear transparent and responsive accountability system must be in place and collaboratively developed by the school community to monitor performance and be able to act appropriately on gaps and gains. Table 11 presents data as results of documentary analysis regarding the assessment of accreditors on central schools in terms of accountability and continuous improvement.

**Table 11 Accountability and Continuous Improvement**

Schools	Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1. School A	1.80	Better
2. School B	2.00	Better
3. School C	3.00	Best
4. School D	1.40	Good
5. School E	2.80	Best
6. School F	1.40	Good
7. School G	2.14	Better

As shown in Table 11, only two central schools were rated best. These schools were school C with a consistent rating of 3.00 and school E with a rating of 2.8. This could be because these schools were found to be having collaborative performance to achieve goals. Performance accountability was practiced in their schools and there were also recognitions and incentive system.

Given the lowest assessment by the accreditors based on documents reviewed and analyzed were school D and school F which both got a rating of 1.4 or good. This indicates that these central schools were already doing the right things; it is just that there is still a need for them to work more in enhancing and improving their accountability systems. More so that accountability is a very important component to make those entrusted with the responsibility to contribute to growth and development of pupils do their share.

Resource Management. To be able to manage resources properly, they must be managed collaboratively and judicially with transparency, effectiveness and efficiency. Table 12 presents data as results of documentary analysis regarding the assessment of accreditors on central schools in terms of resources management.



**Table 12** Resource Management

Schools	Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1. School A	1.80	Better
2. School B	2.40	Better
3. School C	3.00	Best
4. School D	1.20	Good
5. School E	3.00	Best
6. School F	1.60	Better
7. School G	1.92	Better

Relative to accreditors' assessment on the performance of central schools in terms of management of resources, data in documentary analysis revealed that schools C and E consistently performed best as evidenced in the rating of 3.00. This could be because accreditors found that these schools had regular dialogue for planning and resource programming which was inclusive and continuously engaged stakeholders in the implementation of education plan. This relates with what the study of Jenlink<sup>[12]</sup> revealed that the most effective schools are the ones that had a clear vision of how the school could serve its students; had aligned resources and priorities with the vision and could engage stakeholders, in achieving the goals embedded in the vision.

**CONCLUSIONS**

*Based on the Findings of the Study, the Following Conclusions are Drawn*

1. Public elementary schools in CALABARZON had a very satisfactory performance in all areas of development
2. Public elementary schools involved in institutionalized accreditation showed good participation.
3. Schools C and E out of seven schools showed consistent best assessment in all areas.

**References**

1. World Bank (2008) Decentralized Decision-Making in Schools: The theory and Evidence on School-Based Management
2. Jokela, P. (2017). Theory, Method and Tools for Evaluation Using a Systems based Approach (1st ed., Vol. 1, Ser. 2017). Kalmar, Sweden: EHealth Institute. doi:file:///C:/Users/
3. Kane, M. B., & Mitchell, R. (2016). Implementing Pulic School Performance Assessment Promises, Problems, and Challenges. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

4. Ruggiero, J. (2014). Performance Evaluation in Education Modeling Educational Production (1st ed., pp. 346-364). Springer, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
5. Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2011). The Effect of Evaluation on Performance: Evidence from Longitudinal Student Achievement Data of Mid-career Teachers.2(17).Retrieved May 30, 2018, from <http://www.nber.org/>
6. papers/w16877 Grauwe, A. D., &Naidoo, J. P. (2017). The School Monitoring and Performance Evaluation System (2nd ed., Vol. 3, Ser. 2017, pp. 58- 67, Rep.). Kuala, Lumpur, Malaysia: ANTRIEP International Report.
7. Diabré, Z. (2012). Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating Public School Performance [Pamphlet]. One United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017, USA: United Nations Development Program.
8. Arcelo, A. (2013). In pursuit of Quality Education through Accreditation: the Philippine Experience (1st ed., pp. 15-35). Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.
9. Macha, W., Mackie, C., &Magaziner, J. (2018). Education in thePhilippines. WENR World Education News and Reviews Journal,2(1), 57-69. Retrieved from <https://wenr.wes.org/2018/03/education-in-the-philippines>
10. Hasbun, T., & Rudolph, A. (2016). Navigating the Waters of Accreditation Best Practices, Challenges, and Lessons Learned from One Institution (6th ed., pp. 23-25). Texas, USA: SAGE.
11. Chaffee, S. (2017). Accountability and Assistance System: Massachusetts' Framework for District Accountability & Assistance. Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 3(1), 37-40.Retrieved from <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/>.
12. Jenlink, P. M. (2014). School Accountability: The Role of Elementary and Secondary School Principals, Principal Duties and Responsibilities,

**How to cite this article:**

Dr. Nerrie E. Malaluan and Lucia F. Tolentino (2019) 'Institutionalized Accreditation of Public Elementary Schools in the Calabarzon Area', *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*, 08(05), pp. 18915-18923. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijcar.2019.18923.9456>

\*\*\*\*\*