**Chapter 2**

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES**

 Several studies have been made in other countries, as well as in the Philippines, with direct or indirect bearing on the subject to be studied. Those included in this chapter provided the theoretical framework of the study.

**Schools Stakeholders**

 A stakeholder is an individual or group with an interest in the success of an organization in fulfilling its mission—delivering intended results and maintaining the viability of its products, services and outcomes over time. (<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/stakeholderlores.pdf>)

 According to Campbell, C. & Rozsnyai (2002) a stakeholder is someone who has a vested interest, financial, social or otherwise in an action or organization. According to Spillane (2007) stakeholders in higher education mean specific groups of external actors that have a direct or indirect interest in higher education and cannot always be covered by the consumer-provider analogy.

 Hence, an education stakeholder includes students, academics, employment and careers advisors, teaching and learning managers, employers of recent graduates, business deans, professional bodies, libraries, PTAs and other parent organizations. The roles of each stakeholder in a school district provide an integral part to the entire organization. According to Watson and Reigeluth, education is undergoing a systemic perceptual change, as a result of society’s dissatisfaction with individual learner’s achievement in the education arena. In education, most systemic transformation efforts involve stakeholders that are critical to achieving the desired changes, as asserted by Watson and Reigeluth. To foster a better understanding of the roles of the stakeholders in the educational arena, It is necessary to explain the roles of six distinctive educational stakeholders-school board members, superintendent, site administrator, teachers, parents, and students-who are closely involved in the overall operations of schools. It is also important to describe influential factors for each of the stakeholders’ roles, which may better define the significance of each educational stakeholder.

According to C.R.M. Dlamini SC (2004) The Department of Education has a number of stakeholders. These are people or organisations with a stake or an interest in education. The interests of these stakeholders vary. There are those who have an immediate and direct interest in education. There are also those who have a general interest and there are those who have a casual interest in education. The various stakeholders include the learners, the parents, the educators, school governing bodies, the educator unions, the non-governmental organisations, the private sector and the potential employers to mention a few most important ones. Their contributions can be harnessed to improve the quality of education in the province. It is essential that the Department should always bear the interests of the learners at heart.

 However, according to Coleman (1988, 1990), social capital is a resource embedded in social relations between different actors. In his theoretical considerations, Coleman distinguishes between certain characteristics of social relations as driving forces of action. Coleman regards a sense of trust in the reciprocity of a relation between two actors as especially important, which entails a belief that the relation is important for both actors and consists of expectations and obligations. Moreover, social relations are utilized as valuable channels for information and produce shared norms as well as sanctions, which can be useful in processes of action. Furthermore, Coleman explains that a social relation needs to be close and embedded in the appropriate context in order to create social capital. According to Coleman, social capital is the third important resource besides economic resources and human capital, and indicates a child’s social background. Social capital is not necessarily connected to the family’s economic resources or human capital and therefore exerts an independent effect on children’s school performance. Thus, children from non-privileged backgrounds can profit from close and strong social ties. In line with his general theoretical assumptions, Coleman emphasizes the relevance of families’ social capital (besides parental economical and human capital) for a child to acquire human capital. In this context, Coleman distinguishes between social capital within the family and social capital between the family and the family’s environment. With regard to the latter point, Coleman illustrated the importance of social relations between the family and the family’s academic environment by revealing the relevance of this relation for the creation of human capital by generating intergenerational closure over many contacts to different actors. A strong and close relationship between parents, children and teachers creates a climate of discipline and trust, which is beneficial for children’s learning progress.

Another positive effect of good contacts between students, teachers and parents is that of a more efficient support in school-related matters and an enhanced exchange of information relevant for academic achievement. Moreover, a climate of good contacts and relationships with others helps establishing shared norms and values, for instance the perception of good grades as a valued and desired outcome. Besides, strong and close relations between parents and teachers foster expectations for rewards, such as better grades for students with committed parents.

 The process of education is concerned chiefly with the interaction between the stakeholders (students, teacher, professional bodies, libraries, PTAs and other parent organizations together with the classroom practices that occur within the school environment) and students’ academic achievement. Parents within the context of the family and home provide the child with the security, support and guidance necessary for his or her proper intellectual and moral growth.

Furthermore, the quality of students’ performance remains at top priority for educators. It is meant for making a difference locally, regionally, nationally and globally. Educators, trainers, and researchers have long been interested in exploring variables contributing effectively for quality of performance of learners. These variables are inside and outside school that affect students’ quality of academic achievement. These factors may be termed as *student factors, family factors, school factors and peer factors* (Crosnoe, Johnson & Elder, 2004).

**Stakeholders in Education**

Adams (2005) acknowledged that the existing relationship between the impact of stakeholders and students’ academic performance has not been quite clear, it is not worthy that various experts and researchers had endeavored to establish a solid relationship between the impact of stakeholders and students’ academic performance. The teacher is employed primarily to impart knowledge as well as contribute to existing knowledge. According to Berlak (2000), academic success is, no doubt, the main focus of all educational activities which has received tremendous attention from stakeholders. However, prediction of academic success is still not clear. Apparently, predictability of academic achievement is a complex (and by no means an easy) task.

**Internal Stakeholders**

Internal stakeholdersare those who work within the school system on a daily basis and who largely control what goes on there. They include school staff, district staff, and, to some extent, school boards.

(<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/stakeholderlores.pdf>)

Some stakeholders have very close links with an organisation and would be greatly affected by it success or failure and these are known as internal stakeholders the pupils, teachers, head teacher, and local authority.

According to Victoria Homes Elementary School in Muntinlupa City, Students, teachers, and administrators and parents can be considered internal stakeholders in an educational institution. Each one of them plays an important role for the success and development of a school. Without the students, there will be no teachers. And without the administration and the parents, the organization’s mission, vision/goals cannot be achieved.

 Internal stakeholders participate in the creation of the training and they directly determine its process and result. They are mostly the staff of the school organization (teachers, administrative staff, other school employees, school managers: headmaster and his/her staff). They have a critical interest in the organizational achievements and in their own professional motivations.(http://www.expero2.eu/expero1/hypertext/m\_cap\_2.htm)

**External Stakeholders**

External stakeholdersare those outside the day-to-day work of the schools who have a strong interest in school outcomes but who do not directly determine what goes into producing those outcomes.

(<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/stakeholderlores.pdf>)

 Moreover, the distinction between internal and external

education stakeholders is important. With respect to a school improvement effort, such as a school wide reading model, internal stakeholders clearly have greater capacity to produce positive change in schools, but they don’t have all of the power needed to sustain it. Because of factors that can affect organizational performance over time (such as staff attrition, shifting priorities and “mission drift”), improved outcomes achieved one year can easily fade the next. For this reason, external stakeholders also have a critical role to play in sustaining improved outcomes. When the long-term success of a school system is deemed important, we must ask: “To whom do the schools belong?” and “Who has a long-term vested interest in the success of our schools and students?” In answering these questions, we quickly find ourselves at the doorstep of our constituents: the families who send their children to our schools, the taxpayers who support the schools, and the businesses who hire our graduates. In this light, external stakeholders can be highly motivated and can become powerful drivers to help achieve and sustain positive change in our schools.

**School Administrator/School Head**

School administrators who work in elementary, middle and high schools are also known as principals. They usually have master’s or doctoral degree in educational leadership or administration.

In addition, Education administrators manage the overall operation of schools. In addition, they set and oversee academic standards and ensure that teachers have the tools and resources, such as training, necessary to meet these standards.

Education administrators typically do the following: Supervise [teachers](https://www.sokanu.com/careers/teacher/) and other school staff, such as [school counselors](https://www.sokanu.com/careers/school-counselor/) and librarians. Observe and monitor teachers to evaluate their effectiveness. Help teachers improve their teaching skills by arranging professional development programs and mentorships. Ensure that staff have the tools and resources they need to do their jobs effectively. Discipline students and help teachers manage students’ behaviour. Meet with parents and teachers to discuss students’ progress and behaviour. Review test scores and other data to assess the school’s progress toward local, state, and federal standards. Manage the school’s budget and finances. Ensure school facilities are safe for students and staff. Advocate on behalf of the school to ensure it has the necessary financial support.

The site administrator represents the single most influential stakeholder in the school setting (Spillane, Camburn, and Pareja, 2007), and is expected to set the academic tone for students, parents, staff, and community members through effective participatory leadership. Effective site administration leadership develops a collaborative team approach to decision making and problem solving (U. S. Department of Labor, 2008), while simultaneously and consistently developing and maintaining district wide policies and guidelines. Additionally, the successful site administrator employs a distributive approach to routine school operations to ensure maximum involvement of other internal and external stakeholders (Spillane, Camburn, and Pareja, 2007).

**School Administrator and Quality Education**

 According to the study of John Aluko Orodho(2014) ,World Bank (2008) posits that much research has demonstrated that retention and the quality of education depends primarily on the way schools are managed, more than the abundance of available resources, the capacity of schools to improve teaching and learning is strongly influenced by the quality of the leadership provided by the headteacher. Concerted effort to improve school leadership is one of the most promising points of intervention to raise retention, the quality and efficiency of secondary education. Well managed schools contribute to educational quality and enhance retention (Graig & duParisis, 1998).

 As stated by,(Goker, 2006) ,For the past two decades, legislators and the public have provided external pressures to encourage schools to develop and change places of education. Leadership and School Restructuring have been in the forefront of school reform in the effort to focus on school improvement and student achievement.

 On the other hand, basing on the study of Hallinger and Heck, (1996) they emphasized the fact that administrative leadership was among the factors that made the greatest difference in student understanding and learning. However, the nature of this relationship remained open to debate and research.

 In addition, studies of Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982) which studies considered pioneering efforts directed toward a deeper understanding of instructional leadership roles of a school principal. These researchers emphasized that a school principal, through his or her activities, roles, and behaviors in managing school structures does not affect student achievement directly.

**Student Clubs/Organizations as Stakeholders**

The administrative structure in educational institutions makes provision for student leadership. In line with this provision, Students’ Representative Councils (SRC) are found in most educational institutions. In most cases, the representatives are elected by the students themselves after school administration nominates candidates for various positions. In other cases, students are allowed to nominate and elect their own leaders. Student leaders exhibit some unique characteristics that endear them to the hearts of their colleagues. They are great orators who sound very convincing. They seem to know all the problems of their colleagues and are quick to promise having antidotes to all such problems. A careful analysis of events however reveals that all the characteristics displayed by most student leaders are just for the purposes of winning their confidence which are expected to be translated into votes for them. The involvement of school administration in the choice of school prefects stems out of the concern about the calibre of students put in leadership positions. Whilst students insist on electing radical and fearless colleagues who would always champion their course, school administrators advocate for brilliant and moderate student leaders who would not embarrass the school. The policy in the University of Cape Coast is that, to qualify for any leadership position one needs a Cumulative Great Point Average (CGPA) of at least 2.5 or better.

 Student leaders are generally expected to compliment the efforts of faculty in the effective running of their institutions. They also serve as the mouthpiece of students in the promotion of cordial relationship between students and faculty. Research has provided sufficient information about the key characteristics of student leaders. However, there is a growing need for continued improvement and reflective practice on the continuous development of leadership skills. It has been observed that much time is expended by student leaders in the performance of their role to the detriment of their academic work.

As stakeholders, students need to be involved in the administration and smooth management of distant education programmes. Astin (1985) stated that the more students are involved in student activities, including leadership activities, the greater their success in learning and personal development will be. On student leadership position and academic performance, Cress et al. (2001) concluded that all students have leadership potential and that institutions of higher education can uncover and develop this potential with targeted programs that will also increase the student’s educational success. They also asserted that educational institutions will be successful in developing tomorrow’s leaders when they provide connections between academic programs and community activities and express a strong desire, through their stated mission, to create a “legacy of leaders in businesses, organizations, governments, schools, and neighborhoods”

 A study carried out by the Office of Institutional Research (2011) demonstrated that serving as a club leader, no matter how many terms served, had lasting impact and was a positive contributing factor in relation to student academic performance, especially with regard to facilitating graduation. This study revealed that remedial students who served as club leaders outperformed non‐club leader remedial students in terms of retention rate, GPA and Good Standing rate at the second year. Remedial student club leaders continued to maintain a significantly higher 3‐year retention rate than non‐club leader remedial students while maintaining levels of GPA and Good Standing that were similar to that of non‐club leader remedial students at the third year.

 The results of the study revealed that students’ perception of their leadership role is high. This high perception however has no relationship with age, level, employment status, prior leadership experience or gender. It is also concluded that high academic performance is not dependent on perceived student leadership characteristics, role expectations, and duties and responsibilities. However, perceived leadership role expectation was found to be the least potent contributor to academic performance of students.( Paul Dela Ahiatrogah and, Albert  Kobina Koomson, 2011)

 However, Waters, Marzanno, and McNulty (2003) reported that leadership behaviours significantly correlated with student achievement.

According to Edie L. Holcomb(2007)students' uncanny insights in their own words and illustrates how a responsive principal involves all student segments, creates an audience for their ideas and suggestions, and engages their authentic participation with staff in decision making. Using only existing resources, educators can practice real democracy within their school community by inviting students to discuss their interests, needs, and preferences about school matters.

 [Adam Fletcher](http://soundout.org/author/adam/) added that moving beyond listening to student voice, this model engages every student as a partners with adults throughout schools. This model introduces non-traditional, highly effectual opportunities for students in hallways, classrooms, principals’ offices, school boardrooms, and beyond. Meaningful student involvement is a model for school improvement that strengthens the commitment of students to education, community and democracy. It re-envisions the roles of students in equitable partnerships with adults throughout the learning environment. It promotes student engagement by securing roles for students in every facet of the educational system and recognizes the unique knowledge, experience and perspective of each individual student.

Furthermore,all schools everywhere, all the time should consider student engagement their ultimate objective for learners. The question of whether students have a sustainable connection to learning, schools and education does not merely affect the economy; it drives democracy and sustains healthy social interdependence for everyone. When schools disengage students, adults must assume responsibility and do something to change the situation.

**Student involvement and Academic Performance**

Determining the optimal amount of involvement in student organizations has implications for educators and student affairs professionals (Keeling, 2004). The extent to which students are actively engaged in the school experience can have either a positive or a negative effect on academic success (Community College Survey of Student Engagement, 2008; Holland & Andre, 1987).

**Teachers as Stakeholders**

The teacher, along with the student, plays an interactive role in the education process because one cannot function without the other. “The empowerment of teachers will facilitate the empowerment of students (Short and Greer, 2002).” Teacher empowerment takes the form of providing teachers with a significant role in decisions making, control over their work environment and conditions, and opportunities to serve in a range of professional roles (Short and Greer, 2002). The teacher as a stakeholder is expected to possess the professional knowledge to lead the students in instruction. In addition to serving in an instructional role the teacher can be a mentor, supervisor, counselor, and community leader. The teacher can be a mentor to students or other teachers. The teacher is motivated to fulfill their role with an understanding of how important teachers are to society. Without teachers, our society would not be able to function as a global competitor.

As expressed byAhmad Othman Bourini, a curriculum specialist at the curriculum department of the Ministry of Education in Dubai, “The classroom teacher is an influential factor that determines the success of a curriculum as he would be the one who takes the responsibility to implement it and ensures meeting the students’ needs. He is one of the major stakeholders whom we highly consider in the process of designing the curriculum.”

 According to National education Association, teachers as stakeholders, use effective instructional strategies, maintain high standards for all students by providing a rigorous curriculum, understand and capitalize on students' diverse cultures, examine their expectations, beliefs, and practices through the equity lens, serve as "first responders" in identifying students who need additional instructional support. Participate in professional development programs that provide them with strategies for working with students and their families who are not achieving success.

**The role of teachers**

Philosophies such as Buddhism and Confucianism advocate the enhancement and glorification of filial piety: the respect and devotion of an individual for their parents and teachers. In a predominantly Buddhist country such as Myanmar, teachers have traditionally been regarded as one of the -five gems’ and considered on the same plane as the Buddha (who himself was a teacher), the Scriptures, monks and parents. In such societies, teachers assume the role of substitute parents. This places a great amount of responsibility on them. The social roles of teachers and students are drawn so rigidly that expecting the latter to participate in dialogue and decision making is often deemed inappropriate (Han Tin 2004). Teachers have great potential to act as agents of change. Teachers are crucial players in any endeavour to create a more enlightened population. Kennedy (1998) has pointed out that -outcomes of education are affected by the quality of the teaching workforce. As Hattie (2004) remarked, -it is what teachers know, do and care about which is very powerful to the teaching-learning equation’. Teachers have one of the most significant influences on the learning of students. The function of teachers is essential, as they have to inculcate important values in future generations and ensure the holistic development of their students. In addition to this, teachers have the potential to use their status in the community to try to interact with parents and influence them in such a way that they will be less authoritarian towards their children. By changing the mind-set of parents, teachers will be making it possible for future generations to move away from the dominator-type of society that exists today.

**Teachers and Academic Achievement**

The results reveal large differences among teachers in their impacts on achievement and show that high quality instruction throughout primary school could substantially offset disadvantages associated with low socioeconomic background. These differences among teachers are not, however, readily measured by simple characteristics of the teachers and classrooms. Consistent with prior findings, there is no evidence that a master’s degree raises teacher effectiveness. In addition, experience is not significantly related to achievement following the initial years in the profession. These findings explain much of the contradiction between the perceived role of teachers as the key determinant of school quality and the body of research showing that observed teacher characteristics including experience and education explain little of the variation in student achievement. ( Steven G. Rivkin, Eric A. Hanushek, And John F. Kain, 2005).

However, Kara and Russell (2001) comment that there has been no consensus on the importance of specific teacher factors, leading to the common conclusion that the existing empirical evidence does not find a strong role for teachers in the determination of academic achievement.

 Finally, according to Olanipekun, Shola Sunday, Aina, Jacob Kola(2014), the teacher is a very important resource in any educational system. According to them, the most important educational resources is teacher.

**Parent and Teacher Association**

 The National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) has established and promulgated a set of National Standards for Family-School Partnerships which includes language consistent with efforts both to improve individual student outcomes and to advocate for and support school improvement efforts. (http://www.pta. org/1216.htm),

 Parents-Teacher Association is mandatory in the basic education in the Philippines. This institution provides additional help to the school specially those problems concerning the school and learners. The Department of Education established this in order for the school to have an opportunity to reach out with the community to where it belongs.

 Following Muller and Kerbow (1993), there are three main areas or “contexts” in which parental involvement takes place: at home (Yap and Enoki, 1995; White, 1982; Lee, 1993; Zellman and Waterman, 1998; Fehrmann et al., 1987), (b) in the community

(Coleman, 1987; Jaggia and Kelley-Hawke, 1999; Muller and Kerbow, 1993) and in the school (Stevenson and Baker, 1987; Epstein, 1992, Epstein and Dauber,1991; Muller and Kerbow, 1993). From a policy perspective, parental involvement in the school is perhaps the most important area for analysis since this can be controlled directly (as opposed to indirectly through parental involvement in the home) by educators and

administrators (Feuerstein, 2000). Parental involvement in schools can occur in a variety of ways. Among these are volunteering directly in the classroom, (b) attending or participating in children's activities at school and (c) participating in a PTG. Empirical support for the effect of parental involvement in these three areas is mixed. Stevenson and Baker (1987, p. 1350), using a sample of 179 teachers and children, test the effect of parental involvement in “activities of the school such as PTO and parent-teacher conferences” on student achievement. They find that parental involvement is associated with higher student achievement. Using a sample of 42 elementary schools in a “large suburban area,” Griffith (1996) also finds support for the effect of parental involvement on student achievement. Hara and Burke (1998) conclude that parental involvement can positively affect student achievement in inner-city schools. However, recent research by Okpala and colleagues (2001) finds no significant relationship between the number of parental volunteer hours and fourth grade mathematics achievement. At the middle school level, research using the 1988 NELS data on eighth grade middle school children is suggestive that PTG attendance of parents is associated with higher student achievement (Muller, 1993; Desimone, 1999; Sui-Chu and Willms, 1996). However, two of these studies (Muller, 1993; Sui-Chu and Willms, 1996) cast doubt on the overall robustness of these findings. Further, these studies are conducted on students who are less than one year away from entering high school. In sum, given the paucity of research on elementary school students (and parents), we believe the overall effectiveness of parental involvement in elementary schools remains an open research question.

 According to Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Wentzel, (1999) the quality of parent–teacher relationship has consequences for children’s achievement.

**Parent- Teacher Association and School Governance**

Kamba (2010) observed that involving stakeholders in governance and management of schools improves the quality of education system. Parental involvement in schools takes different kinds and forms or aspects. However, his article focuses only on Board of Governors (BOG) and Parent Teacher Association (PTA). BOG and PTA constitute part of the formal structures of governance through which parents and the community are enabled to participate in the education of their children. It is assumed that through such structures educational provision is enhanced, and school governance and educational quality is improved. According to Azeem (2010) school governance generally becomes weak due to poor parental involvement in school financial management and key decision making areas.

 The Scottish Parents Teachers Council (SPTC) offers the following definition of PTA which is very fitting in the parental involvement discourse (Edwards and Redfern, 1988a): “A local people who recognize that the education of a child is a process of partnership between parents and teachers( Ijaz Ahmad Tatlah et al.).BOG and PTA both contribute to educational development in various ways and because of their nature and status are meant to perform different but complementary roles in the school.

**Local Government Unit**

 Notwithstanding the devolution of many basic services to LGUs, basic education is still largely the responsibility of the central government and is delivered through the Department of Education (DepEd). However, LGUs do provide supplementary funding support to public basic education because they have access to a sustainable source of financial resources that are earmarked for the basic education subsector, the Special Education Fund (SEF). The monies in the SEF come from an additional 1% tax on real property that LGUs are mandated by the Local Government Code (Republic Act 7160 of 1991) to impose and collect. On the average, total SEF income of all LGUs combined is equal to 0.23% of GDP in 2001-2008 while total SEF spending of all LGUs in the aggregate is equal to 0.19% of GDP during the same period. While SEF spending does not seem large when compared to either total general government education spending on basic education (7.4%) or total DepEd spending (8.1%), it is substantial when reckoned relative to DepEd spending on non-personal services (69%) or DepEd maintenance and operating expense or MOOE (110%). Moreover, SEF expenditures of all LGUs in the aggregate is estimated to be about 2.4 times as large as total DepEd allocation for school level MOOE in 2007.Thus, if one assumes that all of the SEF expenditures of all LGUs are spent on school level MOOE and if the SEF were distributed across LGUs in direct proportion to enrollment, then per student SEF spending would equal to PhP692. This figure is substantially higher than the average DepEd school level MOOE allocation of PhP293 per student at both the elementary and secondary level (Manasan and Castel 2009). Thus, LGUs are considered major partners of the national government in the delivery of basic education services. Their participation particularly in providing funding support is critical in achieving the Education For All targets.

` However, based on the study of Gargallano (2015) it was found out that one of the financial supports of the National Government through the LGU which is the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program(4 Ps) has no significant relationship on the scholastic performance of the students.

**Local School Board**

 Public education in the Philippines is a centrally managed service delivered through the Department of Education (DepEd). At the local level, the DepEd maintains schools divisions and districts corresponding to the three biggest local government units – the provinces, cities and municipalities. The divisions and districts in turn supervise elementary (Grades I to VI) and high schools (1st to 4th year) that comprise the basic education system in the country. A local school board (LSB) is a special body created by virtue of Republic Act No. 7160, popularly known as the Local Government Code of 1991 (LGC 91). Its main duty is to allocate the Special Education Fund (SEF) to meet the supplementary needs of the local public school system. LSB is chaired by the city mayor, co-chaired by the schools division superintendent, and made up of the following members: the chair of the education committee of the Sangguniang Panlungsod (city council), the city treasurer, a representative of the Sangguniang Kabataan (youth council), and duly elected representatives of the city PTA league, the city teachers' organization, and the non-academic personnel of city public schools.(<http://pcij.org/blog/wpdocs/Robredo_Reinventing_School_Boards.pdf>)

**Local School Board and Academic Performance**

 In recent decades, however, school boards have been the target of criticism by those who perceive them as outdated and incapable of effectively leading educational reforms to improve students’ academic achievement, particularly in urban areas (Carol, Cunningham, Danzberger, Kirst, McCloud, & Usdan, 1986; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger, Carol, Cunningham, Kirst, McCloud, & Usdan, 1987; Danzberger, Kirst, & Usdan, M.D., 1992; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; Finn, 1991; HarringtonLueker, 1996; Kirst, 1994; NSBF, 1999; Olson, 1992; Streshly & Frase, 1993; The Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Todras, 1993; Whitson, 1998; Wilson, 1994).

 Resnick (1999) states that school boards have traditionally focused on financial, legal, and constituent issues, and have left responsibility for students’ academic achievement to their administrators and educators. Today, however, school boards risk being judged ineffective if they do not develop policies and support programs explicitly designed to improve students’ academic achievement, oversee and evaluate the implementation and performance of these policies and programs, and demonstrate improved and/or high academic achievement (Carol et al., 1986; NSBF, 1999; Resnick, 1999; Speer, 1998). The National School Boards Foundation [NSBF] (1999) proclaimed that a school board’s primary goal must be to improve academic achievement. The NSBF released the 1999 report, Leadership Matters: Transforming Urban School Boards, to help school boards improve students’ academic achievement. The National School Boards Association [NSBA] has urged local school boards to make the improvement of student achievement a major objective (Speer, 1998). The NSBA published Bracey and Resnick’s (1998) guidebook, Raising the Bar: A School Board Primer on Student Achievement, Speer’s (1998) report, Reaching for Excellence: What Local School Districts Are Doing to Raise Student Achievement, and Amundson & Richardson’s (1991) handbook, Straight As: Accountability, Assessment, Achievement. In addition to national organizations, state and local groups have begun working to focus school boards on academic achievement. The Kansas City Consensus, a group funded through donations from local corporations, foundations, and individuals, convened a School Governance Task Force and released the 2001 report, Steer, Not Row: How to Strengthen Local School Boards and Improve Student Learning. In the report, the task force stated that it “defined effectiveness in terms of student learning, as that is the only indicator that matters” (p. 6). The Educational Research Service and the New England School Development Council released Goodman, Fulbright, and Zimmerman’s (1997) guidebook, Getting There From Here: School Board-Superintendent Collaboration: Creating a School Governance Team Capable of Raising Student Achievement and Goodman and Zimmerman’s (2000) report, Thinking Differently: Recommendations for 21st Century School Board/Superintendent Leadership, Governance, and Teamwork for High Student Achievement. School board members and district staffs also express a need for school boards to focus on achievement. In a 1997- 1998 national survey, school board members identified student achievement as their foremost concern (ASBJ, 1998). School board presidents, superintendents, and high school principals in a survey of 92 Wisconsin school districts frequently recommended concentration on student achievement and school improvement as a change that would improve the effectiveness of their school boards (Anderson, 1992). Unfortunately, a lack of time and established procedures, as well as the demands of numerous crises, often may preclude many school boards from devoting time directly to the improvement of students’ academic achievement (Carol et al., 1986).

**Parents as stakeholders**

 In the early years, parents are their children’s first teachers — exploring nature, reading together, cooking together, and counting together. When a young child begins formal school, the parent’s job is to show him how school can extend the learning you began together at home, and how exciting and meaningful this learning can be. As preschoolers grow into school age kids, parents become their children’s learning coaches. Through guidance and reminders, parents help their kids organize their time and support their desires to learn new things in and out of school.

(http://www.pbs.org/parents/education/going-to-school/supporting-your-learner/role-of-parents/)

Involvement allows parents to monitor school and classroom activities, and to coordinate their efforts with teachers to encourage acceptable classroom behavior and ensure that the child completes schoolwork. Teachers of students with highly involved parents tend to give greater attention to those students, and they are more likely to identify at earlier stages problems that might inhibit student learning. Parental involvement in school, and positive parent-teacher interactions, have also been found to positively affect teachers’ self-perception and job satisfaction.

 (<http://www.childtrends.org/?indicators=parental-involvement-in-schools#sthash.wNRlCb7x.dpuf>)

 The percentage of students whose parents reported involvement in their schools rose significantly between 1999 and 2007 across several measures, including attendance at a general meeting, a meeting with a teacher, or a school event, and volunteering or serving on a committee.  However, these proportions fell or remained the same in 2012. (<http://www.childtrends.org/?indicators=parental-involvement-in-schools#sthash.wNRlCb7x.dpuf>)

**Parents and Academic Performance**

It is generally accepted that the quality of family interactions has important associations with children’s and adolescents’ academic motivation and achievement, and with young adults’ eventual educational and occupational attainments. Thomas Kellaghan and his colleagues (1993) claim, for example, that the family environment is the most powerful influence in determining students’ school achievement, academic motivation, and the number of years of schooling they will receive. Similarly, Coleman (1991) states that parents’ involvement in learning activities has substantial emotional and intellectual benefits for children. He observes, however, that because supportive and strong families are significant for school success, teachers confront increasing challenges as many children experience severe family disruption and upheaval. Although it is acknowledged that families are perhaps the most substantial influence on children’s school success, it is not always clear which family influences are the most important. In addition, research findings are inconclusive about the extent to which relationships between family interactions and academic performance are independent of a child’s family background and family structure. Parents play key roles as educational stakeholders. Parents’ primary objective is the assurance that their children will receive a quality education, which will enable the children to lead productive rewarding lives as adults in a global society (Cotton and Wikelund, 2001). Parents bring a valuable quality to the educational experience of their children because they may better understand their own children and can influence significantly student behaviors such as time management and study habits, eating practices, and their personal safety and general welfare. Parents as educational stakeholders provide additional resources for the school to assist with student achievement and to enhance a sense of community pride and commitment, which may be influential in the overall success of the school. For instance, parent involvement with their children’s educational process through attending school functions, participating in the decision making process, encouraging students to manage their social and academic time wisely, and modeling desirable behavior for their children represent a valuable resource for schools across this nation, according to Cotton and Wikelund.

Academic achievement is a tenacious topic of interest within the research community because researchers have found it to be a gauge of students’ adjustment to school and their future success (Rao, et al. 2000). Different researchers have concluded that students performance is closely interlinked with different factors which affect the performance in a positive or negative way, these factors can be behavioral, psychological, and social. It was found that children and youngsters who perform well academically, experience positive schooling develop social capability, and engage in pro-social behavior and establish good relationships with parents, teachers and peers (Masten, et al. 1995).

 There are many researches which have investigated that participation of parents in their educational matters is utmost important (Bergsten 1998). Many researchers have resulted that if the parents take part in their children’s educational activities on regular basis, it enhances the performance of the children (Driessen, et al. 2005).

Parental role construction is important not just because it affects parents’ decisions about whether and how to become engaged, but also because role construction is intimately linked to academic achievement. Parental aspirations and expectations for their children’s education have a strong relationship with academic outcomes (Fan and Chen 2001). In turn, a parent’s sense of efficacy and belief in their ability to help their children is central to whether they perceive themselves as contributing meaningfully to their children’s education and the level to which they become involved with their children’s schooling (Gutman and Akerman 2008).

The lowest likelihood of engagement therefore occurs when parental role construction is weak – that is, when parents don’t believe they need to be or should be involved in their child’s education and, simultaneously, have a low sense of efficacy (Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler 1995; 1997). By offering specific recommendations about how to be and remain appropriately engaged in their child’s learning, parental beliefs about the importance of their own role in education can change (Pushor 2007). This highlights the link between parents’ perceptions of their own roles and the actions that teachers and schools take to engage parents.

However, Gannan (2012) held that the greatest determining factor in the academic success of students is parental involvement and parental encouragement. The author concluded in his study that: “Good schools make a difference, but parental involvement better predicts a child’s performance than the qualities of the school he or she attends” However, parental involvement has an unquestionable role to play in helping schools attain excellence in academic performance (Uemura, 1999; Gabathuse, 2010:1).

However, according to Singh, Bickley, et al., (1995) which states current knowledge regarding the nature and magnitude of the effects of parental involvement in secondary education that is inconsistent and limited in scope.

**The Role of Stakeholders in Education towards Optimal Learning Outcome**

All stakeholders have the potential to benefit from the educational process. At a macro level, parents, communities, and schools make up a complex network of interactions that require continual give-and-take from each in order to best serve the learner. This dynamic relationship between parents, communities, and schools is in a constant state of flux as the learner progresses from K-12 as the learner becomes more independent and requires more real-world application. From a micro perspective, parents, communities, and schools each maintain a series of sub-networks that contribute to the overall educational process as well. Understanding the contributions and the benefits required from parents (or learners), communities, and schools both from a macro and micro perspective presents the complex network that is the educational process. The basis for improving learner outcomes through the development of dynamic relationships between parents, communities, and schools stems from the creation of an overall learning community. Sergiovanni’s theory (1999) of community consists of two ideal extremes: community (gemienschaft) and society (gesellschaft). Being part of a community refers more to a family-type relationship that focuses on the -we- as opposed to the -I-. Success is defined by the overall success of community and not solely on individual successes. In contrast, in a societal environment participants are more isolated and lonely as they each have certain agendas for justifying their interaction with others. Most schools, according to Sergiovanni (1999), reflect more of a societal phenomenon than on one based on community. In defining community DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, and Many provide insight into what makes a professional learning community among educators: –educators committed to working collaboratively in ongoing processes of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous, job-embedded learning for educators- (as cited in DuFour, DeFour, and Eaker, 2008, p. 14). Although this particular definition pertains to educators, the essence of this definition (i.e., -commitment to working collaboratively in ongoing processes of collective inquiry and action research-) could pertain to any number of stakeholders (e.g., administrators, learners, parents, and community leaders) – each determining their level of appropriate participation. Although the level in which stakeholders participate within a learning community will vary, their participation alone each holds a degree of relevancy. From a macro viewpoint, a principal or university president might conduct a sociological inventory within a given community in order to promote the mission and vision of the school. This communication likely will consider -customs and traditions, population characteristics, existing communication channels, community groups, leadership, economic conditions, political structure, social tensions, and previous community efforts- (Bagin, Gallagher, and Moore, 2008, p. 18). Based on these factors, community leaders and taxpayers decide as to the degree of their participation. While all will pay taxes, some will be more legitimate participants by developing community projects that involve learners and through public donations that provide more school resources, for example. From a micro viewpoint, administrators, teachers, and learners work towards a school mission and vision through the interaction of various relationship patterns. Regardless of the relationship, the -we- must continually be the focus and not the -I-. This vital distinction also transfers to the classroom. The classroom as a learning community in and of itself contains a network of relationships that is greatly influenced by the teacher, as Ginott stated: I’ve come to the frightening conclusion that I am the decisive element in the classroom. It’s my daily mood that makes the weather. As a teacher, I possess a tremendous power to make a child’s life miserable and joyous. I can be a tool of torture or an instrument of inspiration. I can humiliate or humor, hurt or heal. In all situations, it is my response that decides whether a crisis will be escalated or de-escalated and a child humanized or de-humanized- (as cited in DuFour, DeFour, and Eaker, 2008, p. 283)The teacher drives the network within the classroom as relationships build between the teacher and student as well as between student and classmate. Just considering these two stakeholders resides a vast number of dynamic networks at play. Pair work, small group, and full group combinations create numerous network learning connection possibilities that enable learners to deepen their understanding of what is being taught. In other words, teachers have the power to provide learners with numerous educative experiences if learners are given the opportunity to assist and be assisted by all their classmates through a variety of one-on-one, small group, and large group activities. In addition to the learning networks available here, teachers may also open up an even greater learning network through the use of technology. The internet, for example, provides the means for bridging learners to the community, so instead of learners being mediated only by their teachers, textbook, and classmates, they are now also being mediated by other students and experts that extend beyond the confines of the classroom. But in order to maintain order in such a classroom learning environment that fosters collaborative work, two strategies must be established from the beginning in order to prevent chaos: presenting clear objectives, and implementing proper assessment practices (DuFour, DuFour, and Eaker, 2008). Having clear objectives that the learners can understand and providing the means for formative and self-assessment better guide learners through the educational process. The curriculum and standards dictate a lot of what the desired results within the classroom should look like. But teachers who can frame these desired results in a purposeful way for the learners create a more meaningful logic as to why they are doing what they are doing in class. Moreover, the criteria for successful work should be modeled from the beginning with rubrics, for example, that descriptively state how learners will be assessed. Once the desired results have been explicitly stated, a -learning progression- (Popham, 2008) takes the learner through a series of sub skills and enabling knowledge as the learner moves towards the curricular aim. As the learners moves through this progression, elicited-assessment evidence dictates as to when the teacher decides to make instructional adjustments and when the teacher needs to suggest a change in learner tactics. Thus, learners are receiving continual feedback on their performance (i.e., formative assessment) and are given multiple opportunities to reflect and revise on their own work. Therefore, in a classroom learning community, performance tasks are presented in a purposeful way and assessment is supportive in nature and avoids ranking the learner with the other classmates.

**Academic Performance**

 Academic achievement represents performance outcomes that indicate the extent to which a person has accomplished specific goals that were the focus of activities in instructional environments, specifically in school, college, and university. School systems mostly define cognitive goals that either apply across multiple subject areas (e.g., critical thinking) or include the acquisition of knowledge and understanding in a specific intellectual domain (e.g., numeracy, literacy, science, history). Therefore, academic achievement should be considered to be a multifaceted construct that comprises different domains of learning. Because the field of academic achievement is very wide-ranging and covers a broad variety of educational outcomes, the definition of academic achievement depends on the indicators used to measure it.

Academic achievement as measured by the GPA (grade point average) or by standardized assessments designed for selection purpose such as the SAT (Scholastic Assessment Test) determines whether a student will have the opportunity to continue his or her education (e.g., to attend a university). Therefore, academic achievement defines whether one can take part in higher education, and based on the educational degrees one attains, influences one’s vocational career after education.

 In Philippine setting, the proper indicator of how well does a pupil/student perform academically is being contained to the grades he/she receives.

In the Philippines’ Department of Education has recently issued and ordered a grading system for K to 12 curriculum.

This includes the grading scale to be used.

Grade Scale: Descriptors

90 -100 Outstanding

 85 - 89 Very Satisfactory

 80 - 84 Satisfactory

 75 - 79 Fairly Satisfactory

 Below 75 Did not meet expectations

Educators, trainers, and researchers have long been interested in exploring variables contributing effectively for quality of performance of learners. These variables are inside and outside school that affect students’ quality of academic achievement. These factors may be termed as student factors, family factors, school factors and peer factors (Crosnoe, Johnson & Elder, 2004).

**School-Based Management**

 School-based management (SBM) is a strategy to improve education by transferring significant decision-making authority from state and district offices to individual schools. SBM provides principals, teachers, students, and parents greater control over the education process by giving them responsibility for decisions about the budget, personnel, and the curriculum. Through the involvement of teachers, parents, and other community members in these key decisions, SBM can create more effective learning environments for children.

According to the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and other sources, some of the advantages of SBM are:allow competent individuals in the schools to make decisions that will improve learning;give the entire school community a voice in key decisions;focus accountability for decisions;lead to greater creativity in the design of programs;redirect resources to support the goals developed in each school;lead to realistic budgeting as parents and teachers become more aware of the school's financial status, spending limitations, and the cost of its programs; and,improve morale of teachers and nurture new leadership at all levels.

The school board continues to establish a clear and unifying vision and to set broad policies for the district and the schools. SBM does not change the legal governance system of schools, and school boards do not give up authority by sharing authority (AASA/NAESP/NASSP, 1988). The board's role changes little in a conversion to SBM.

The superintendent and his or her district office stafffacilitate the decisions made at the school level, and provide technical assistance when a school has difficulty translating the district's vision into high-quality programs. Developing student and staff performance standards and evaluating the schools are also the responsibility of the district staff.

The district office will generally continue to recruit potential employees, screen job applicants, and maintain information on qualified applicants from which the schools fill their vacancies. The district office may also specify curricular goals, objectives, and expected outcomes while leaving it up to the schools to determine the methods for producing the desired results. Some districts leave the choice of instructional materials to the schools, whereas others may require schools to use common texts.

In most SBM systems, each school is given a "lump sum" that the school can spend as it sees fit. As outlined by JoAnn Spear (1983), the district office determines the total funds needed by the whole district, determines the districtwide costs (such as the cost of central administration and transportation), and allocates the remaining funds to the individual schools. The allocation to each school is determined by a formula that takes into account the number and type of students at that school.

Each school determines how to spend the lump sum allocated by the district in such areas as personnel, equipment, supplies, and maintenance. In some districts, surplus funds can be carried over to the next year or be shifted to a program that needs more funds; in this way, long-range planning and efficiency are encouraged.

Most districts create school management councils at each school that include the principal, representatives of parents and teachers, and, in some cases, other citizens, support staff, and--at the secondary level--students. The council conducts a needs assessment and develops a plan of action that includes statements of goals and measurable objectives, consistent with school board policies.

In some districts, the management council makes most school-level decisions. In other districts, the council advises the principal, who then makes the decisions. In both cases, the principal has a large role in the decision-making process, either as part of a team or as the final decisionmaker.

From the beginning, the school board and superintendent must be supportive of school-based management. They must trust the principals and councils to determine how to implement the district's goals at the individual schools.

It is important to have a written agreement that specifies the roles and responsibilities of the school board, superintendent and district office, principal, and SBM council. The agreement should explicitly state the standards against which each school will be held accountable. James Guthrie (1986) states that each school should produce an annual performance and planning report covering "how well the school is meeting its goals, how it deploys its resources, and what plans it has for the future."

Training in such areas as decision-making, problem solving, and group dynamics is necessary for all participating staff and community members, especially in the early years of implementation. To meet the new challenges of the job, principals may need additional training in leadership skills.

In summary, SBM must have the strong support of school staff. It is more successful if it is implemented gradually. It may take 5 years or more to implement SBM. School and district staff must be given administrative training, but also must learn how to adjust to new roles and channels of communication. Financial support must be provided to make training and time for regular staff meetings available. Central office administrators must transfer authority to principals, and principals in turn must share this authority with teachers and parents.

Participitory decision-making sometimes creates frustration and is often slower than more autocratic methods. The council members must be able to work together on planning and budget matters. This leaves principals and teachers less time to devote to other aspects of their jobs. Teachers and community members who participate in the councils may need training in budget matters; some teachers may not be interested in the budget process or want to devote time to it.

Members of the school community must also beware of expectations that are too high. According to the AASA/NAESP/NASSP task force, districts that have had the most success with SBM have focused their expectations on two benefits--greater involvement in making decisions and making*"better"* decisions.(<https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/OR/ConsumerGuides/b>

aseman.html)

**Department of Education School-Based Management**

According to DepEd former Secretary Jesli A. Lapus, from the Manual on the Assessment of School-Based Management Practices of the Department of Education released in 2009, the Department has stepped up its efforts to decentralize education management – a strategy that is expected to improve the Department’s operating efficiency and upgrade education quality. Accelerating the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM),a key component of Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda or BESRA. With SBM, the school as key provider of education, will be equipped to empower its key officials to make informed and localized decisions based on their unique needs toward improving our educational system.

The said Manual on Assessment of School-Based Management Practices has been produced as a tool to help educators manage and run schools efficiently and effectively. It highlights the strategic importance of educating children and other stakeholders in participating in educational activities. This emphasis will make the task of school heads and teachers easier, as the community will be one with them in their efforts to improve the school. The content of this Manual has been developed and prepared with the participation of education specialists who have practical and diverse experiences in their field. The concepts have been pilot-tested in several projects such as the Third Elementary Education Project (TEEP), the Secondary Education Development and Improvement Project (SEDIP), Basic Education Assistance for Mindanao (BEAM) and Strengthening the Implementation of Basic Education in the Visayas (STRIVE). The projects have created tremendous positive changes and improvement in the schools. After being tried out in project sites, the concepts were further validated by school heads in remote schools. He can say with full confidence that these concepts have been tried, tested and passed strict scrutiny.

In implementing SBM, the Department is doing all it can to create an environment where all the people involved commit to make change happen under a decentralized setup. This change is ultimately geared towards the school children’s enjoyment of their right to quality education and other equally important rights such as the right to be safe and healthy, to be protected from harm and abuse, to play and to have leisure, to express their views freely, and to participate in decision-making according to their evolving capacities. For this new setup to succeed, our principals and teachers need to develop their people skills and managerial capabilities. They have to be empowered to be catalysts for change in our schools. Be empowered to strengthen partnerships, engage education stakeholders and produce graduates who are fully equipped for the 21st century.

In the said SBM assessment tool, the school’s stakeholders were classified into internal and external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders includes the school administration/school head, student clubs/organizations, teachers, Parent-teacher Association and the external stakeholders includes Local Government Unit/Local School Board, School Governing Council, parent association representative and alumni.

 The Division of La Carlota last November 25, 2014 made an evaluation about the School-based Management of La Granja National High School where the result rated the school as developing which is the second highest rating of the performance of the school-based management practices which includes stakeholders’ support. Such rating based on the School-Based Management tool, means La Granja National High School is in level 2 in which the school is introducing and sustaining continuous improvement process.