

**Through the lenses of CIPP model: An evaluation of the implementation
of school improvement plan**

Sheraly M. Sanchez*

Sabang Elementary School, Sabang, Sibonga, Cebu, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the implementation of the School Improvement Plan during the School Year 2022 - 2025 cycle in the selected elementary schools in Sibonga District, Cebu. It used the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model as an evaluation approach. The research targets aimed to examine the extent of SIP implementation, compare the intended objectives with actual implementation, and explore the implementers' experiences. After the researcher also developed a strategic action plan based on the findings. The data collection used a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design. Data cases include school heads, teachers, SELG Presidents, PTA Presidents, Barangay Captains, and Barangay Councilors Committee on Education. The researcher developed an instrument comprising a four-point Likert scale and semi-structured interview guides, which were first validated and pilot-tested before distribution. After collecting all data, the quantitative results were analyzed using weighted means and standard deviations, while the qualitative results were examined using a comparative matrix and thematic analysis. Findings revealed that SIP Implementation across the four domains was generally perceived as highly implemented, with a weighted mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 0.54. In terms of the intent of implementation, the gaps identified were broader target, resources, stakeholder participation, workload, time constraints, monitoring procedures, and delays in implementation. Moreover, thematic findings showed that SIP implementation was viewed by implementers as a shared responsibility, demonstrating collaboration, adaptability, and resourcefulness despite implementation challenges. Based on the findings, the SIP-PRIME Strategic Action Plan was proposed to strengthen planning, resource mobilization, stakeholder engagement, implementation, and monitoring.

Keywords: School improvement plan (SIP), CIPP evaluation model, SIP implementation, sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, implementation gaps, implementers' experiences, SIP-PRIME strategic action plan.

Date Submitted: July 12, 2026

Date Accepted: July 25, 2026

Date Published: July 30, 2026

*Corresponding author / Email: sheralysanchez8@gmail.com

Recommended citation:

Sanchez, S. (2026). Through the lenses of CIPP model: An evaluation of the implementation of school improvement plan. *Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (3), 1491-1506.

INTRODUCTION

Planning helps schools decide what needs attention and what actions may improve learner outcomes. In the Philippine educational system, schools are encouraged to use planning as a way of responding to school concerns and improving performance. This direction is supported by the Basic Education Development Plan (BEDP) 2030, which highlights quality learning, stronger school governance, and responsive educational programs as important priorities in education. One of the tools commonly used in schools is the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Schools use the SIP in identifying priorities and organizing programs based on the needs of learners and the school community. Through DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015, schools are guided to use school data, participatory planning, and regular monitoring in carrying out interventions.

School improvement planning has been discussed by different authors as a way of helping schools respond to learner and school needs. James (2024) noted that schools may benefit from having clear priorities and organized interventions that address existing concerns. In the same way, Huizenga (2024) explained that School Improvement Plans often serve as guides that schools revisit while monitoring progress and making adjustments when necessary. In actual school practice, planned activities do not always happen in the same way, but a clear plan may help schools stay focused on their goals.

Schools in DepEd Cebu Province continue to implement programs that support literacy, numeracy, learner promotion, and school performance. Still, school situations are not always the same. Some schools are able to continue planned activities without many concerns, while others experience difficulties that affect how programs are carried out. In some cases, available resources and support from stakeholders make a difference in how schools continue improvement efforts.

The study of Agra, R. M. (2023) also pointed out the importance of planning, monitoring, and stakeholder participation in school performance. At the same time, the study noted that schools may still experience concerns during implementation, which shows the need for continued improvement in carrying out school programs.

Even with existing policies, questions still remain on how School Improvement Plans are actually carried out in schools and whether intended goals are achieved in practice. Existing studies primarily focus on school planning practices and educational outcomes; however, limited research has examined SIP implementation through the CIPP framework while simultaneously exploring implementors' experiences within the local context. Because of this, there is a need to better understand how SIP implementation takes place and what concerns may influence its implementation.

This study examined the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) in selected public elementary schools in the District of Sibonga, Cebu. Specifically, it examined SIP implementation in terms of context, input, process, and product, explored the differences between intended and actual implementation, and examined the experiences of implementors in relation to their roles and responsibilities, challenges and barriers, strategies and coping practices, perceived successes and lessons learned, and insights and recommendations for future implementation. To provide a broader understanding of SIP implementation, the study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, complementing quantitative findings with qualitative insights from SIP implementors. The findings of the study may contribute useful information for understanding SIP implementation and school improvement practices in the local context.

In the context of selected elementary schools in Sibonga, a better understanding of SIP implementation may help identify areas that could be further strengthened in school planning and implementation practices. Consequently, a strategic action plan named SIP-PRIME,

grounded in the findings of the study, may serve as a possible basis for supporting more responsive and context-sensitive SIP implementation in the local setting.

This study used the Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model developed by Daniel L. Stufflebeam. This model is known for its comprehensive framework in evaluating every detail of any educational program. The CIPP model carefully examines every part of a program, from its crafted plan and resource availability to its implementation and achieved outcomes. From the study of Iqbal et al. (2021), the model has been described as a successful evaluation approach used to monitor and improve the quality of projects, evaluation systems, institutions, and educational programs throughout the world.

In this study, the CIPP model served as the theoretical and conceptual framework for assessing how well SIPs are executed in selected elementary schools in Sibonga, Cebu. It guided the assessment of SIP implementation through the lenses of the four interrelated domains.

The first part, Context Evaluation, examined the alignment of the SIP goals with the actual needs, priorities, and conditions of the school community. This domain emphasizes the identification of contextual realities that are a basis for setting appropriate objectives. Input evaluation examined the adequacy of resources, strategies, plans, and support systems necessary for achieving SIP objectives. This domain determines whether available resources and support systems are adequate in the attainment of planned intervention.

The reviewed literature and studies provided important information about School Improvement Plan (SIP) implementation, the use of the CIPP Model in educational evaluation, challenges experienced during program implementation, and the role of stakeholder participation in school improvement efforts. Previous studies showed that proper planning, leadership support, monitoring, available resources, and stakeholder involvement contribute to the implementation of school programs. At the same time, concerns related to workload, limited resources, and inconsistent participation were also identified as factors that may affect implementation.

Previous studies already discussed different aspects related to School Improvement Plan implementation. Some studies focused on school performance, while others looked at implementation practices or the participation of stakeholders. There were also studies that used the CIPP Model in evaluating educational programs. However, many of these studies were conducted in settings different from public elementary schools and were not directly focused on SIP implementation. In some cases, concerns related to implementation and stakeholder support were discussed separately, making it difficult to see how these concerns connect with the overall implementation of the School Improvement Plan.

In the local setting, limited studies have explored SIP implementation using the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) Model, particularly in selected elementary schools in Sibonga, Cebu. There also appears to be limited literature that examined not only the extent of implementation but also the difference between intended and actual implementation, including the experiences of implementors in carrying out SIP activities. Because of this gap, the present study was conducted to evaluate SIP implementation through the lens of the CIPP Model and to gain a better understanding of how implementation is carried out in the selected schools.

Statement of the problem

The primary purpose of this study was to evaluate the implementation of the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) from the School Year 2022 to 2025 cycle in selected public elementary schools in the Municipality of Sibonga, Cebu, using the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model as the basis for a proposed strategic action plan. This study was guided by the following research questions.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following:

1. What is the extent of School Improvement Plan (SIP) implementation in terms of the Context, Input, Process, and Product dimensions of the CIPP Evaluation Model?
2. How do the intended School Improvement Plan (SIP) objectives compare with the actual implementation of SIP programs across the Context, Input, Process, and Product dimensions of the CIPP Evaluation Model?
3. What are the experiences of School Improvement Plan (SIP) implementors in terms of their roles and responsibilities, challenges and barriers encountered, strategies and coping mechanisms employed, perceived successes and lessons learned, and insights and recommendations for future SIP implementation?
4. Based on the findings of the study, what strategic action plan may be proposed to enhance School Improvement Plan (SIP) implementation?

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design to examine the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) in selected elementary schools in Sibonga, guided by the CIPP Evaluation Model, which stands for Context, Input, Process, and Product. In this design, quantitative data were gathered first, followed by qualitative data intended to further explain and support the initial results. The study began with the quantitative phase to determine the extent of SIP implementation in the selected schools. A structured survey based on the CIPP Checklist was used to gather data from members of the school planning team, focusing on the four areas of the CIPP model and describing how SIP activities were being carried out in schools. To describe the level of implementation, the collected responses were examined through weighted mean and standard deviation, providing an initial picture of how SIP implementation was carried out across schools.

Following the quantitative phase, qualitative data were collected to learn more about how SIPs were carried out in schools. Data collection was accomplished through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with school heads, teachers, SELG Presidents, PTA Presidents, Barangay Captains, or the barangay Councilor chair in education. This part of the study looked into whether planned SIP activities were carried out as intended and explored the different situations encountered during implementation, including concerns and challenges experienced by implementors. Responses were examined through thematic analysis and a comparative matrix to identify common ideas and patterns that provided more information about the results obtained during the earlier phase of the study. The quantitative and qualitative findings were then examined together through triangulation, with similarities and differences in the results considered to gain a clearer understanding of SIP implementation in the selected schools. Combining both sets of findings helped explain not only the level of implementation but also the reasons behind the results. Lastly, the findings of the study became the basis for a proposed strategic action plan intended to improve SIP implementation, including practical activities and recommendations that may help strengthen planning, implementation, monitoring, and stakeholder participation in future SIP cycles.

This study was conducted in the municipality of Sibonga, Cebu Province, chosen because it has public elementary schools located in different communities, including areas near the roadside and upland barangays. These different school settings provided an opportunity to examine how School Improvement Plans (SIPs) were carried out in varying conditions. Eleven public elementary schools in the Sibonga District took part in the study. The researcher selected schools from different locations and school sizes to better understand how SIPs were implemented under different school conditions. Some schools were located near the roadside, while others were in upland areas, and differences in school size, available resources, and community situations gave the study a wider view of SIP implementation in the district. The study included five small schools, namely Abugon Elementary School, Bae Elementary School, Basak Elementary School, Guimbangco-an Elementary School, and Magcagong Elementary School. It also included five medium sized schools, namely Candaguit Elementary School, Cansantic Elementary School, Lamacan Elementary School, Manatad Elementary School, and Papan Elementary School. Sibonga Central Elementary School was the only large school included in the study.

The quantitative phase of the study used a structured survey questionnaire to determine the extent of School Improvement Plan (SIP) implementation in selected elementary schools in Sibonga. The instrument was researcher developed and patterned after the CIPP Checklist of Daniel Stufflebeam, guided by the CIPP framework developed to examine four areas, namely Context, Input, Process, and Product (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017). Although based on the CIPP framework, the questionnaire items were written and modified by the researcher to fit the objectives of the study, particularly in assessing the extent of SIP implementation. The questionnaire was administered to the same respondents involved in the study, including school heads, teacher representatives, SELG Presidents, PTA Presidents, and Barangay Local Government Unit (BLGU) representatives directly involved in SIP implementation. The instrument contained statements measured through a four-point Likert scale to determine the level of SIP implementation in terms of Context, Input, Process, and Product. It featured Likert scale items on a four-point scale: 4 – Strongly Agree (SA), 3 – Agree (A), 2 – Disagree (D), and 1 – Strongly Disagree (SD). Respondents marked their level of agreement with each item by placing a check mark on the appropriate point of the scale.

The study used both quantitative and qualitative analysis to answer the research questions on School Improvement Plan (SIP) implementation, with the analysis following the CIPP framework, which focused on Context, Input, Process, and Product. To answer the first research question, the responses from the survey questionnaire were summarized using weighted mean and standard deviation. These were used to describe the extent of SIP implementation in terms of Context, Input, Process, and Product, with the weighted mean helping describe the level of implementation and the standard deviation showing how close or varied the responses were. For the second research question, a comparative matrix was prepared to compare the intended SIP objectives with what was carried out in schools. The matrix was used to look at areas where implementation matched the intended plans, where some parts were only partly carried out, and where differences or gaps were observed across the CIPP areas. To examine the third research question, thematic analysis was used to review the information shared by participants during the scheduled interview sessions and group conversations. The recorded responses were transcribed and read several times to better understand the information shared by the participants, after which responses were grouped according to common ideas and recurring patterns related to SIP implementation. The analysis included participants' roles and responsibilities, challenges encountered, ways of addressing concerns, successes, lessons learned, and suggestions for future SIP implementation. Before

the actual conduct of the study, the qualitative instruments were checked by experts and pilot tested, which helped improve the clarity of questions and ensured that the interview guide covered the needed topics related to the study. After analyzing both sets of data, the researcher examined the quantitative and qualitative findings together. The results were reviewed to see where the findings were similar and where differences appeared in relation to SIP implementation, and looking at both sets of information helped provide a fuller understanding of SIP implementation in the selected schools.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the study, which examined the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) in eleven selected public elementary schools in the municipality of Sibonga, Cebu Province, during the School Year 2022 to 2025 cycle. The discussion is grounded in the data gathered through a sequential explanatory mixed methods design anchored on the CIPP Evaluation Model of Daniel L. Stufflebeam, which examined the Context, Input, Process, and Product dimensions of SIP implementation. Quantitative data were obtained from respondents composed of school heads, teacher representatives, SELG Presidents, PTA Presidents, and Barangay Local Government Unit representatives who answered a researcher developed structured questionnaire patterned after the CIPP Checklist and analyzed using weighted mean and standard deviation. Qualitative data were subsequently gathered through semi-structured interviews and a Focus Group Discussion with implementors including school heads, teachers, SELG Presidents, PTA Presidents, Barangay Captains, and barangay Councilor's chairing education, and were examined through a comparative matrix and through thematic analysis following the framework of Braun and Clarke (2016). The findings that follow are interpreted directly in relation to the objectives of the study, namely to determine the extent of SIP implementation, to compare intended and actual implementation across the CIPP domains, and to explore the experiences of SIP implementors, after which the quantitative and qualitative results are triangulated to arrive at a fuller understanding of SIP implementation in the selected schools.

The overall implementation of the School Improvement Plan in the selected elementary schools in Sibonga was found to be very highly implemented, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 0.54, with the standard deviation indicating that respondents gave fairly similar ratings and reflecting consistency in their assessment. Among the four dimensions, context obtained the highest weighted mean ($WM = 3.75$, $s = 0.45$), followed by input ($WM = 3.49$, $s = 0.59$), product ($WM = 3.44$, $s = 0.55$), and process ($WM = 3.39$, $s = 0.55$), all interpreted as very highly implemented. This pattern suggests that schools generally demonstrated strong efforts in identifying school needs, allocating resources, implementing activities, and achieving intended outcomes. The high rating in the context dimension may indicate that schools were responsive in identifying school priorities and aligning SIP goals with school realities and educational policies, while the consistently high ratings across the remaining dimensions may suggest that schools exerted considerable effort in implementing planned interventions despite existing operational challenges. These findings should not, however, be interpreted as indicating perfect implementation, but rather a generally strong level of practice among schools, a pattern consistent with the principles of school based management emphasized by the Department of Education, which holds that effective school planning depends on participatory decision making, proper resource allocation, and continuous monitoring (DepEd, 2015), and with studies suggesting that SIP implementation becomes more effective when schools utilize data driven planning and collaborative stakeholder participation (Iqbal et al., 2021; Huizenga, 2024).

With respect to context, which focuses on how schools identify their needs, set priorities, and align their goals with institutional and educational directions, the dimension was found to be very highly implemented, with an overall weighted mean of 3.75 and a standard deviation of 0.45, indicating that respondents' ratings were not widely dispersed and reflecting a common perception of how SIP context was implemented in their schools. Among the indicators, the highest rated item was the alignment of SIP goals with current DepEd and local development priorities (WM = 3.83, s = 0.38), while stakeholder engagement in identifying priorities obtained the lowest mean (WM = 3.67, s = 0.52), although it remained within the very highly implemented level. These findings suggest that schools were generally responsive in identifying school needs and aligning SIP goals with institutional priorities, likely because schools increasingly rely on school data, performance indicators, and policy directions in developing improvement plans. The relatively lower mean on stakeholder participation, however, may suggest opportunities to further strengthen collaborative planning among parents, local government units, and other community partners, and since SIP implementation begins with appropriate goal setting and problem identification, effective contextual planning may contribute to better implementation of succeeding SIP activities. These findings are consistent with the principles of the CIPP Evaluation Model, which emphasizes that educational plans should be grounded on actual needs and contextual realities, and with studies suggesting that school improvement efforts become more responsive and sustainable when planning is informed by reliable data and stakeholder participation (Iqbal et al., 2021).

With respect to input, which focuses on the adequacy of resources, personnel preparation, stakeholder support, and planning mechanisms needed to carry out SIP activities, the dimension was found to be very highly implemented, with an overall weighted mean of 3.49 and a standard deviation of 0.59, indicating that respondents' ratings were relatively close to one another and reflecting comparable perceptions regarding the adequacy of resources, planning support, and implementation preparations. Among the indicators, the strategic allocation of resources according to school priorities received the highest mean (WM = 3.61, s = 0.59), while support from external partners such as LGUs and NGOs obtained the lowest mean (WM = 3.39, s = 0.61), although it remained within the very highly implemented level. These findings suggest that schools generally prioritize available resources and establish clear implementation structures, although external collaboration may vary depending on stakeholder availability and local support mechanisms. Since adequate inputs contribute to effective program execution, strong preparation and proper allocation of resources may help facilitate smoother implementation of planned interventions, while the slightly lower rating on external partnerships may indicate opportunities for strengthening collaboration with community stakeholders. These findings support the input dimension of the CIPP Evaluation Model, which emphasizes the importance of resources, strategies, and preparedness in achieving program goals, and are consistent with studies suggesting that effective educational planning depends on sufficient resource support and collaborative stakeholder engagement (Sankaran & Saad, 2022; DepEd, 2015).

With respect to process, which focuses on the implementation, monitoring, and adjustment of SIP activities, the dimension was found to be very highly implemented, with an overall weighted mean of 3.39 and a standard deviation of 0.55, indicating that respondents' ratings were relatively similar and reflecting a generally common perception regarding the conduct and management of SIP activities. Among the indicators, making adjustments based on feedback or challenges received the highest mean (WM = 3.46, s = 0.50), while the implementation of activities as scheduled obtained the lowest mean (WM = 3.34, s = 0.56), although it remained within the very highly implemented level. These findings suggest that

schools generally demonstrated flexibility in responding to implementation concerns and maintained monitoring practices, although the lower mean on timely implementation may indicate occasional delays or adjustments due to school related constraints. Since process implementation focuses on how plans are translated into action, regular monitoring and adaptability may contribute to the continuity of SIP activities and the achievement of intended goals, although maintaining consistent implementation schedules may remain an area for continuous improvement. These findings are consistent with the process dimension of the CIPP Evaluation Model, which emphasizes monitoring, feedback, and responsiveness during implementation, and with studies suggesting that continuous monitoring and timely adjustments help educational programs remain aligned with school needs and implementation realities (Aziz et al., 2018).

With respect to product, which focuses on the outcomes, sustainability, and observed results of SIP implementation, the dimension was found to be very highly implemented, with an overall weighted mean of 3.44 and a standard deviation of 0.55, indicating that respondents' ratings were relatively similar and reflecting comparable perceptions regarding the outcomes and results of SIP implementation. Among the indicators, the observation of intended and unintended outcomes obtained the highest mean ($WM = 3.46$, $s = 0.50$), while the indicator on reaching target beneficiaries received the lowest mean ($WM = 3.41$, $s = 0.57$), although it remained within the very highly implemented level. These findings suggest that schools generally observed positive outcomes from SIP implementation and considered its effects sustainable over time, although the slightly lower mean on beneficiary reach may indicate differences in the extent to which interventions fully addressed the needs of all intended recipients. Since product evaluation focuses on outcomes, the findings may indicate that SIP activities contributed to school improvement efforts and generated observable results, although continuous monitoring may still be necessary to ensure that improvements are maintained and that intended beneficiaries consistently benefit from SIP interventions. These findings support the product dimension of the CIPP Evaluation Model, which emphasizes the importance of assessing both intended and unintended outcomes, and are consistent with the position of the Department of Education that SIP implementation should be measured through observable school improvements and sustained outcomes that respond to school needs (DepEd, 2015; Aziz et al., 2018).

Taken together, the findings across the four dimensions indicate that SIP implementation across the selected schools was perceived as very highly implemented in terms of context, input, process, and product, suggesting that schools generally exerted efforts to align school improvement plans with identified needs, provide necessary resources, implement planned interventions, and attain intended outcomes. The consistently high ratings may indicate that School Planning Teams demonstrated commitment in carrying out SIP related activities and responding to school priorities within the implementation period. That context obtained the highest mean may suggest that schools placed considerable emphasis on identifying school needs and aligning goals with institutional priorities and policy directions, while slightly lower mean ratings in the input, process, and product domains may imply that schools encountered varying levels of challenges in areas such as stakeholder engagement, resource mobilization, implementation schedules, and sustainability of interventions. Although these domains remained within the very highly implemented level, the variations in ratings may indicate opportunities for further enhancement to strengthen the overall implementation process, suggesting that effective SIP implementation requires not only well developed plans but also sustained collaboration, adequate resources, and continuous monitoring, and that stronger partnerships with local government units, parents, and community organizations may further support school improvement efforts.

The second objective of the study sought to determine how the intended implementation of SIPs differed from their actual implementation across the four CIPP domains. This was examined through a comparative matrix anchored on the CIPP Evaluation Model as further discussed by Stufflebeam and Zhang (2017), which compared the intended goals, activities, and provisions reflected in school SIP documents against the actual implementation experiences described by participants, drawing on document review, participant responses, and thematic coding of interview data. The findings revealed that although many intended SIP activities were implemented to some extent, variations existed in the degree of implementation, with factors such as resource limitations, time constraints, inconsistent stakeholder participation, and monitoring concerns influencing how intended plans were translated into actual practice and affecting the consistency and completeness of implementation across schools.

In the context domain, which focused on identifying learner needs, school priorities, literacy and numeracy concerns, and establishing realistic goals responsive to school conditions, the intended implementation was generally reflected in actual practice, as participants reported that schools relied on assessment tools, learner performance records, attendance reports, and school-based data in identifying priority concerns. Participant 41 shared that learner needs were prioritized based on assessment results, while Participant 12 stated that needs were based on school data, and Participant 7 explained that priorities were identified based on assessment results, attendance, and stakeholder feedback, with Participant 34 noting that planning was based on school needs and current situation. These responses suggest alignment between intended and actual implementation in terms of evidence-based planning and needs identification. Participant responses also revealed recurring concerns related to low reading proficiency, weak numeracy skills, low academic performance, poor retention, and insufficient instructional materials, alongside institutional priorities such as teacher professional development, child protection, disaster preparedness, differentiated instruction, and community partnerships, indicating that contextual planning was implemented across multiple school concerns rather than academic performance alone. However, variations were also observed, as Participant 56 noted that needs were identified but too broad and lacking specific targets, while Participant 57 emphasized the need for targeted activities addressing learner needs, and Participant 56 further explained that some participation was present but decreased involvement weakens school progress, with other participants noting that not all parents and community members consistently participated in planning activities. These findings imply that schools generally implemented the contextual component of the SIP using available evidence and school records, but variations in stakeholder participation and goal specificity indicate differences in the extent to which contextual planning was carried out, and since the context domain serves as the foundation of SIP implementation, strengthening collaborative planning and ensuring clearer prioritization of needs may contribute to more consistent implementation across schools, consistent with the CIPP Evaluation Model's emphasis on identifying contextual realities and with literature suggesting that SIP implementation becomes more responsive when grounded in school data and stakeholder consultation (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017).

In the input domain, referring to the resources and support mechanisms intended to facilitate SIP implementation including financial resources, manpower, instructional materials, facilities, technical assistance, and stakeholder support, a moderate gap existed between intended and actual implementation, as participant responses revealed variations in the availability and adequacy of resources. Participant responses included statements such as resources were available but limited (P58), books enough but funds came late (P71), and some

resources were available and used well but others were limited (P25), alongside concerns related to shortages in manpower, limited ICT resources, lack of teacher training, insufficient classrooms, and competing teacher responsibilities. Participant 28 noted that resources were adequate but limited, while another participant explained that implementation often depended on availability of funds and stakeholder support (P58), and participants further reported receiving support through PTA contributions, barangay assistance, community partnerships, and local resource mobilization, alongside adjustments in planning due to funding limitations, delayed financial releases, and shortages of materials and facilities. These responses suggest that the intended provision of resources and support mechanisms was only partially reflected in actual implementation across schools, and since the input domain focuses on the adequacy of resources and implementation support, these differences may have implications for how planned SIP activities were carried out, consistent with the input dimension of the CIPP Evaluation Model and with literature suggesting that variations in resource availability and stakeholder support may influence the extent to which school plans are implemented (UNESCO, 2021).

In the process domain, which focused on how SIP activities were intended to be carried out through structured implementation mechanisms such as timelines, meetings, monitoring systems, documentation, feedback processes, and periodic evaluation, the intended processes were generally carried out, although variations were observed in consistency. Participants described implementation processes involving monitoring and evaluation (P2), scheduled activities and assigned responsibilities (P3), regular SIP meetings (P15), and monthly meetings, reports, and evaluation (P35), along with monitoring tools, tracking sheets, school report cards, and School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment (SMEA) processes. However, while some participants reported that activities were mostly followed as planned (P34) or implemented regularly through meetings and reports (P12), others described implementation as followed fairly consistently but not completely (P13), with participants noting that activities were adjusted or delayed (P36), monitoring was inconsistently implemented (P51), and documentation remained incomplete (P56). Factors influencing these processes included limited time, competing workloads, scheduling conflicts, district assignments, and overlapping school activities, with one participant noting that consistency was affected by workload and time (P54), another attributing delays to resource and coordination constraints (P65), and another citing staff busy with school events (P25); monitoring itself was described as becoming less frequent and sometimes informal (P49), adjusted due to schedule conflicts (P52), or reduced from weekly to monthly (P74). Stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation was present but varied, occurring through meetings, classroom observations, consultations, SPT and SMEA participation, PTA engagement, feedback sessions, and home school monitoring, though some participants noted inconsistent participation and difficulties maintaining stakeholder attendance. These findings suggest that the intended SIP implementation processes were generally carried out, but differences emerged in the consistency, completeness, and frequency of implementation across schools, consistent with the process dimension of the CIPP Evaluation Model's emphasis on monitoring, implementation procedures, and feedback mechanisms.

In the product domain, which focused on the intended outcomes of SIP implementation including learner achievement, attendance, retention, literacy, numeracy, school environment, governance, and stakeholder participation, alignment between intended and actual outcomes was found to be partial to moderate. Participants reported improved learner performance (P11), improved literacy and numeracy scores (P28), increased attendance and retention (P36), and strengthened parent community involvement (P70), alongside improvements in school safety, child protection awareness, DRRM preparedness, teacher development, and classroom management, with one participant noting that most objectives were met with minor gaps (P29)

and another citing positive progress due to well-planned interventions (P51). However, other responses indicated that some objectives met, others not fully achieved (P25), described partial alignment (P32), and moderate extent of alignment (P32), with Participant 74 reporting a 95% promotion target but only 92% achieved, and another noting that attendance improved but academic performance fell below expectations. Contributing factors to these gaps included limited resources, time constraints, teacher workload, inconsistent stakeholder participation, funding limitations, and learner absenteeism. Stakeholder perceptions reflected both positive observations and continuing concerns, with several participants describing SIP outcomes as partially successful or positive but with areas for improvement (P32). These findings suggest that intended SIP outcomes were reflected in actual implementation to varying degrees across schools, with improvements evident in participation, attendance, literacy related interventions, and school programs, while some intended academic and performance targets appeared only partially achieved, consistent with the product dimension of the CIPP Evaluation Model's emphasis on examining observed outcomes in relation to intended objectives.

Across the four domains, the comparative analysis suggests that the context domain showed closer alignment between intended and actual implementation, while the input and process domains revealed differences related to limited resources, delayed funding, workload demands, scheduling constraints, and variations in monitoring and documentation practices, and the product domain reflected varying levels of alignment between intended outcomes and actual results. Overall, while intended SIP plans were generally reflected in actual implementation, variations existed across domains and schools, with differences in resource availability, stakeholder participation, monitoring practices, workload demands, and contextual conditions appearing to have influenced the extent to which intended SIP provisions and outcomes were carried out.

The third objective explored the experiences of SIP implementors through a Focus Group Discussion analyzed using the thematic analysis framework of Braun and Clarke (2016), covering their roles and responsibilities, challenges and barriers encountered, strategies and coping mechanisms employed, perceived successes and lessons learned, and insights and recommendations for future implementation. With respect to roles and responsibilities, four themes emerged, namely Collaborative Implementation, Leadership and Supervision, Professional Growth, and Learner-Centered Responsibility. Under Collaborative Implementation, Participant 3 shared that as a teacher, the role is to implement and monitor to ensure plans are effectively executed and aligned with school improvement goals, while Participant 41 explained having served as a teacher-implementer actively participating in planning, execution of activities, coordinating with stakeholders, and tracking learners' progress. Under Leadership and Supervision, Participant 40, a school head, stated that the role in SIP implementation was to lead planning, guide teachers, and monitor the progress of programs, while Participant 58 noted being tasked with planning, coordinating, and monitoring programs and activities. Under Professional Growth, Participant 56, a teacher, shared having started as a mere executor of tasks but evolving into a problem-solver and coordinator. Under Learner-Centered Responsibility, Participant 15 explained that as SELG President, the role involves supporting initiatives addressing literacy and numeracy challenges of pupils. These findings suggest that SIP implementation involved collective participation among teachers, school heads, learners, parents, and community stakeholders, with responsibilities extending beyond classroom instruction and administrative tasks.

With respect to challenges and barriers encountered, four themes emerged, namely Resource Constraints, Time and Workload Demands, Stakeholder and Coordination Challenges, and Monitoring and Implementation Limitations. Under Resource Constraints,

Participant 2, a teacher, simply stated lack of resources, while Participant 17, a barangay captain, shared that the major challenges are lack of funds and limited resources, a finding supported by studies suggesting that insufficient financial and material resources may constrain school improvement implementation by limiting schools' capacity to sustain planned activities (Hallinger & Liu, 2022). Under Time and Workload Demands, Participant 35, a teacher, explained limited resources, time constraints, and heavy workload, while Participant 69, also a teacher, cited heavy workload and role overlap, consistent with literature recognizing workload demands and time limitations as factors affecting implementation (Leithwood et al., 2020). Under Stakeholder and Coordination Challenges, Participant 36, a teacher, cited difficulty ensuring consistent support from stakeholders, while Participant 37, an SELG President, added difficulties in coordination among members. Under Monitoring and Implementation Limitations, Participant 55, a teacher, reported occasional gaps in monitoring and follow-up, while Participant 65, an SELG President, shared difficulties in monitoring and evaluation. These findings indicate that SIP implementors encountered multiple operational, organizational, and contextual challenges that varied across school settings and may have influenced the implementation process.

With respect to strategies and coping mechanisms, four themes emerged, namely Collaborative Problem-Solving, Leadership and Communication Support, Strategic Planning and Prioritization, and Resourcefulness and Adaptive Practices. Participant 36, a teacher, shared that the team worked together, maximized available resources, and sought support from parents and community stakeholders, under Collaborative Problem-Solving. Under Leadership and Communication Support, Participant 12, a teacher, stated that support from the school head helped, while Participant 27, also a teacher, explained that open communication and quick decision-making were crucial, consistent with studies suggesting that supportive leadership and clear communication may strengthen implementation through coordination and shared decision-making (Leithwood et al., 2020). Under Strategic Planning and Prioritization, Participant 6, a teacher, stated to prioritize and focus, and practice time management. Under Resourcefulness and Adaptive Practices, Participant 62, a barangay DRRM representative, shared asking assistance from LGU, consistent with literature suggesting that school leaders often respond to implementation constraints through adaptive planning, collaboration, and resource mobilization (Hallinger & Liu, 2022). These findings indicate that implementors used multiple coping strategies, with approaches varying according to school context and available support.

With respect to perceived successes and lessons learned, four themes emerged, namely Learner-Centered Program Success, Stakeholder Collaboration and Community Support, Effective Planning and Program Implementation, and Adaptive Learning and Continuous Improvement. Under Learner-Centered Program Success, Participant 17, a barangay captain, stated that the most successful aspect of the SIP is the improvement in students' performance, while Participant 32, a school head, shared that the daily reading (Pabasa) program was successful because it was consistently implemented and regularly monitored, a pattern supported by literature suggesting that targeted interventions and continuous monitoring may contribute to improvements in learner participation and academic support (Darling-Hammond et al., 2021). Under Stakeholder Collaboration and Community Support, Participant 37, an SELG President, emphasized that cooperation of stakeholders helped, while Participant 72, a PTA President, noted that parent and teacher collaboration strengthened programs, consistent with studies emphasizing that stakeholder participation may strengthen school improvement efforts through shared responsibility (Leithwood et al., 2020). Under Effective Planning and Program Implementation, Participant 7, a teacher, described successful SIP programs as those directly implementable, data-driven, teacher-led, and supported by stakeholders. Under Adaptive Learning and Continuous Improvement, Participant 6, a teacher, stated that flexibility

is key, while Participant 12, also a teacher, explained that effective planning, teamwork, and continuous monitoring are important, consistent with literature suggesting that school improvement efforts often require adaptive planning and continuous reflection (Hallinger & Liu, 2022). These findings suggest that SIP success was viewed as a continuing process of improvement rather than the complete achievement of all intended outcomes.

With respect to insights and recommendations for future SIP implementation, four themes emerged, namely Evidence-Based and Needs-Responsive Planning, Collaborative and Participatory Governance, Continuous Monitoring and Adaptive Improvement, and Resource and Capacity Strengthening. Under Evidence-Based and Needs-Responsive Planning, Participant 68, a teacher, stated to use real data and evidence, while Participant 31, a PTA President, emphasized that proper identification of SIP requires collecting accurate data, consistent with literature emphasizing that school improvement planning becomes more meaningful when grounded in contextual needs and evidence-based processes (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017). Under Collaborative and Participatory Governance, Participant 68, a teacher, stated that teachers must be involved in planning because they know school needs most, consistent with research suggesting that participatory planning may strengthen accountability and commitment to school improvement goals (World Bank, 2022). Under Continuous Monitoring and Adaptive Improvement, Participant 13, a teacher, stated that SIPs should evolve by regularly reviewing and updating objectives, strategies, and resources, while Participant 54, a school head, recommended flexible planning for unexpected challenges, consistent with the CIPP Evaluation Model's emphasis on continuous evaluation and program improvement (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017). Under Resource and Capacity Strengthening, Participant 57, a teacher, recommended improving resource allocation, while Participant 73, a Barangay Councilor and Chairperson on Education, suggested more trainings for the SIP-SPT team, consistent with literature suggesting that adequate resources and implementation capacity may strengthen the sustainability of school improvement initiatives (Hallinger & Liu, 2022). These findings suggest that implementors envision future SIP implementation as more responsive, collaborative, continuously monitored, and better supported through adequate resources and capacity building.

The results from the quantitative and qualitative phases were integrated through triangulation to provide a more comprehensive explanation of SIP implementation in the selected schools. Quantitative findings revealed that SIP implementation was generally perceived as very highly implemented across the four CIPP domains, suggesting that schools generally exerted efforts to align school plans with identified needs, mobilize available resources, implement planned interventions, and pursue intended outcomes. However, the qualitative findings revealed operational conditions and implementation challenges that help explain variations across domains, indicating that high implementation ratings may not necessarily mean that all intended plans were implemented uniformly across schools. The context domain, which obtained the highest quantitative mean ($WM = 3.75$, $s = 0.45$), was supported by qualitative findings describing the consistent use of school data, learner assessments, and contextual information, although variations in stakeholder involvement were also revealed. In the input domain, rated very highly implemented ($WM = 3.49$, $s = 0.59$), qualitative responses revealed concerns related to limited resources, delayed funding, insufficient materials, and competing school demands, suggesting that schools implemented SIP activities despite operational limitations rather than under ideal implementation conditions. The process domain, rated very highly implemented ($WM = 3.39$, $s = 0.55$), was found through qualitative data to involve challenges such as overlapping activities, time constraints, heavy workload, and inconsistencies in monitoring and documentation, suggesting that while

implementation mechanisms existed, their consistency varied across contexts. The product domain, rated very highly implemented ($WM = 3.44$, $s = 0.55$), was partly supported by qualitative reports of improvements in learner participation, literacy interventions, school-based programs, and stakeholder involvement, although some respondents described partially attained academic targets and continuing learner concerns, implying that not all intended SIP objectives were fully achieved across implementation settings. The qualitative findings on implementors' experiences further help explain how schools sustained SIP implementation despite challenges, with participants emphasizing collaboration, leadership support, resource maximization, communication, prioritization, and flexibility as strategies for addressing implementation barriers, and recommending stronger stakeholder engagement, continuous monitoring, data-driven planning, adaptive implementation, and improved resource support for future SIP cycles.

Taken as a whole, the triangulated findings indicate that SIP implementation in the selected schools was generally very highly implemented across the four CIPP domains, with the overall weighted mean of 3.52 and standard deviation of 0.54 affirming that schools exerted considerable and largely consistent effort in aligning plans with identified needs, mobilizing resources, executing planned interventions, and pursuing intended outcomes. At the same time, the qualitative evidence demonstrates that this high level of implementation was not uniform or unconditional but was achieved through continuous adjustment, resourcefulness, and collaboration among school heads, teachers, and community stakeholders in the face of resource limitations, workload demands, and coordination challenges. These findings contribute to the broader literature on school-based management and the CIPP Evaluation Model by illustrating how quantitative indicators of strong implementation can coexist with, and are more fully explained by, the operational realities, adaptive practices, and lived experiences of the implementors who carry SIPs from planning documents into everyday school practice. This integrated understanding of the extent, variations, and lived experience of SIP implementation in Sibonga's elementary schools provides the empirical basis for the strategic action plan presented in the succeeding chapter, which draws directly on the identified gaps in stakeholder participation, resource adequacy, monitoring consistency, and outcome attainment to propose practical measures for strengthening future SIP cycles.

CONCLUSION

The respondents generally perceived the implementation of School Improvement Plans (SIPs) in the selected elementary schools in Sibonga as very highly implemented across the Context, Input, Process, and Product dimensions of the CIPP Evaluation Model, indicating that schools generally exerted efforts to carry out SIP-related activities within the School Year 2022–2025 cycle. However, the integration of the quantitative and qualitative findings further revealed that the extent of implementation varied across dimensions and implementation realities. The Context domain reflected high to moderate alignment, suggesting that schools generally identified learner needs and priorities using available school data and contextual information, although variations in stakeholder participation and target specificity were observed. The Input domain reflected a moderate gap between intended provisions and actual implementation, as schools encountered concerns related to limited resources, delayed funding, insufficient materials, manpower constraints, and workload demands. Similarly, the Process domain reflected the widest variation, indicating that while implementation systems such as monitoring, meetings, documentation, and planned activities were generally present, consistency in execution differed across schools due to time constraints, overlapping responsibilities, and operational demands. The Product domain reflected partial to moderate alignment, suggesting that while schools reported observable developments in learner

participation, literacy-related interventions, and stakeholder involvement, some intended academic outcomes remained partially attained. Participant experiences further suggest that SIP implementation involved shared responsibility, leadership support, teamwork, planning, communication, and adaptive coping practices that enabled schools to respond to implementation challenges despite existing constraints. These findings imply that the extent of SIP implementation may be shaped not only by planning processes but also by the availability of resources, sustained monitoring, stakeholder participation, and the ability of implementors to respond to changing school conditions. The findings also provide basis for a proposed strategic action plan aimed at strengthening future SIP implementation, particularly in the areas of stakeholder engagement, resource mobilization, monitoring systems, and responsive planning practices. Furthermore, the study affirms that the CIPP Evaluation Model remains a useful evaluative lens in examining SIP implementation within the context of Philippine elementary schools by providing a structured basis for understanding school planning, implementation processes, and implementation conditions. However, since the study focused only on selected elementary schools in Sibonga, future studies may be conducted in other educational settings or levels to further validate, compare, or extend the findings under different implementation contexts.

REFERENCES

- Agra, R. M. (2023). Implementation of School Improvement Plan (SIP) on school performance: Basis for enhancement program. International Journal of Research Publications. IJRP template
- Aziz, S., Mahmood, M., & Rehman, Z. (2018). Implementation of CIPP model for quality evaluation at school level: A case study. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(1), 189–206. ERIC - EJ1180614 - Implementation of CIPP Model for Quality Evaluation at School Level: A Case Study, *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 2018-Jun
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 15(2), 219–234. Now I see it, now I don't: researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research - Roni Berger, 2015
- British Educational Research Association. (2018). Ethical guidelines for educational research (4th ed.). <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2016). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 297–298. Thematic analysis: The Journal of Positive Psychology: Vol 12 , No 3 - Get Access
- Cecilia Azorín, C., Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2021). Taking a distributed perspective on leading professional learning networks. *School Leadership & Management*, 41(1–2), 111–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1816907>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2021). Effective teacher professional development: Research update and policy implications. Learning Policy Institute. ERIC -

ED617576 - Educator Learning to Enact the Science of Learning and Development, Learning Policy Institute, 2022-Jan

Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015: Guidelines on the enhanced school improvement planning (SIP) process and the school report card (SRC). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/09/29/do-44-s-2015-guidelines-on-the-enhanced-school-improvement-planning-sip-process-and-the-school-report-card-src/>

Department of Education. (2022a). DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022: Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/DO_s2022_024.pdf

Hallinger, P., & Liu, S. (2022). Leadership and school improvement: A review of empirical research. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(2), 197–221. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220933901>

Iqbal, Z., Anees, M., Khan, R., Wadood, A., & Malik, S. (2021). A comparative analysis of the efficacy of three program evaluation models: A review on their implication in educational programs. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, 16(10), 77–85. [3477-libre.pdf](https://www.ijetonline.com/vol16/issue10/IJET-21-10-3477-libre.pdf)

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>

Sankaran, S., & Saad, N. (2022). Evaluating the Bachelor of Education Program based on the Context, Input, Process, and Product Model. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, Article 9. [Frontiers | Evaluating the Bachelor of Education Program Based on the Context, Input, Process, and Product Model](https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/feduc.2022.882111)

Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (2020). Expanding approaches for research: Understanding and using trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 44(1), 26–28. Expanding Approaches for Research: Understanding and Using Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research on JSTOR

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Zhang, G. (2017). *The CIPP evaluation model: How to evaluate for improvement and accountability*. Guilford Press. *The CIPP Evaluation Model: How to Evaluate for Improvement and Accountability* - Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Guili Zhang - Google Mga aklat

TravelsFinders. (2017, October). Cebu Philippines map [Map]. TravelsFinders. [cebu map - Search](https://www.travelsfinders.com/cebu-map/)

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO. [https://unesdoc.unesco.org/](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf00186122)

World Bank. (2022). *Improving education systems through school-based management and accountability reforms*. World Bank Publications. *The Mismatch Between World Bank Actions and the Decentralization of Educational Systems in LMICs* - Mobarak Hossain, 2024