



VOLUME / ISSUE	PUBLICATION	ARTICLE TYPE	ARTICLE ID
1 / 1	IROAP	RESEARCH ARTICLE	IROAP Published ID

School-Community Partnership Project in Area 4, Division of Batangas: A Descriptive-Comparative Study

Luningning C. Vidal¹, Randy M. Baja, FRIEdr, CESE²

¹ LGU, Padre Garcia, Batangas

² Email: francesandreacamelle.bandales@ub.edu.ph | Email: randy.baja@ub.edu.ph

DOI	RECEIVED	ACCEPTED	PUBLISHED
10.5281/zenodo.22269118	July 11, 2026	August 7, 2026	August 31, 2026

ABSTRACT

Background. School-community partnership is a key mechanism for improving school governance, stakeholder participation, and learner support. **Objective.** This descriptive-comparative study assessed school-community partnership and coordination in the use of community resources among 103 schools in Area 4, Division of Batangas, Philippines. **Methods.** Data were gathered from 701 respondents consisting of teachers, school community representatives, and school heads using a researcher-made questionnaire, interviews, and school records. Frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, one-way analysis of variance, and Scheffe post hoc test were used. **Results.** Most schools were medium-sized (61, 59.22 percent), had populations classified between sparse and dense (61, 59.22 percent), and were at either the Developing (49, 47.57 percent) or Maturing (48, 46.60 percent) level of School-Based Management performance. Evidence of school-community partnership was greatly evident across shared vision of learning ($M = 3.68$), shared leadership and governance ($M = 3.66$), complementary partnership ($M = 3.65$), effective communication ($M = 3.68$), and family engagement ($M = 3.65$). Coordination in the use of resources was also greatly evident in public relations ($M = 3.67$), follow-up ($M = 3.66$), and proper channeling ($M = 3.67$). Significant differences were reported among respondent groups in shared vision of learning, shared leadership and governance, complementary partnership, public relations, follow-up, and proper channeling; school heads consistently gave higher assessments than teachers and school community representatives. Interview findings identified inadequate and delayed communication, limited participation, lack of trust, unclear roles and channeling, and insufficient resources as continuing concerns. **Conclusion.** Findings support the development and validation of a School-Community Partnership Enhancement Program for Area 4 schools.

KEYWORDS school-community partnership | School-Based Management | stakeholder engagement | family engagement | resource coordination | Batangas

HOW TO CITE Vidal, L. C., & Baja, R. M. (2026). School-Community Partnership Project in Area 4, Division of Batangas: A Descriptive-Comparative Study. *International Research Organization and Academic Publication*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22269118>

1 Introduction

Quality education requires more than classroom instruction. It depends on coordinated action among school leaders, teachers, parents, local government units, community organizations, and other stakeholders who share responsibility for learners development and school improvement. In the Philippine basic education context, School-Based Management (SBM) positions schools as centers of planning, decision-making, accountability, and continuous improvement. It also emphasizes the centrality of learners and the participation of parents and communities in basic education service delivery (Department of Education, 2012, 2024).

School-community partnership provides a practical structure for this shared responsibility. Epstein (2018) explains that stronger educational outcomes are promoted when family, school, and community spheres of influence overlap through purposeful communication, decision-making, volunteering, home learning support, parenting support, and community collaboration. Mapp and Bergman (2019) likewise emphasize that family-school partnerships require capacity building for both educators and families so that engagement becomes relational, developmental, and sustained rather than merely attendance-based.

The dissertation from which this article was converted examined school-community partnership in Area 4, Division of Batangas. The study was motivated by the need to strengthen collaboration among public schools, parents, barangay officials, local partners, and other community stakeholders in support of quality education. It focused on five partnership dimensions: shared vision of learning, shared leadership and governance, complementary partnership, effective communication, and family engagement. It also examined coordination in the use of community resources through public relations, follow-up, and proper channeling.

Although the source study reported generally favorable assessments, it also recognized that partnership is not automatically effective or sustainable. Challenges included delayed communication, limited participation, uncertainty about roles, trust-related concerns, and resource constraints. These concerns justify a journal-style presentation of the findings so that school leaders and education stakeholders can use the evidence as a basis for program validation, implementation, and future research.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to assess school-community partnership in Area 4, Division of Batangas, and to use the findings as a basis for a proposed partnership enhancement program. Specifically, it described the schools according to size, population, and SBM performance; determined the extent of evidence of school-community partnership and resource coordination; tested whether assessments differed among teachers, school community representatives, and school heads; identified issues and concerns affecting partnership; and proposed a school-community partnership project based on the findings.

1.2 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework [VERIFY JOURNAL PERMITS]

The study was anchored on four complementary perspectives. Rogers Diffusion of Innovations Theory explains how new practices and programs are communicated, adopted, implemented, and sustained in a social system (Rogers, 2003). In this study, the theory supports the introduction and institutionalization of partnership practices among schools, families, and community stakeholders.

Epstein Theory of Overlapping Spheres of Influence frames learner development as a shared function of family, school, and community relationships (Epstein, 2018). Bronfenbrenner ecological perspective emphasizes that the interaction between the home, school, and wider community shapes learner development (Bronfenbrenner, 2019). Coleman Social Capital Theory highlights trust, shared norms, communication, and community networks as resources that contribute to educational outcomes (Coleman, 2018). Together, these frameworks justify the assessment of shared vision, shared leadership, complementary partnership, communication, family engagement, public relations, follow-up, and proper channeling as dimensions of functional school-community partnership.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Research Design

The study used a descriptive-comparative research design. The descriptive component described school profiles, partnership practices, resource coordination, and issues and concerns as they existed at the time of data gathering. The comparative component tested whether assessments differed across three respondent groups using one-way analysis of variance and Scheffe post hoc comparisons.

2.2 Setting

The study was conducted among public schools in Area 4, Division of Batangas, Philippines. School records were used to describe 103 schools in terms of size, population, and SBM performance.

2.3 Participants and Sampling

The respondents consisted of 701 individuals from the 103 schools, including teachers, school community representatives, and school heads. The uploaded manuscript did not provide exact respondent-group counts or a complete sampling description in the methods section.

2.4 Instrumentation

The primary instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire aligned with the specific problems of the study. It gathered information on school profile, the extent of evidence of school-community partnership, the extent of schools coordination with communities in the use of resources, and issues and concerns related to partnership. The source manuscript states that the questionnaire was reviewed by the adviser and experts in educational management, school governance, and school-community partnership, then pilot tested for reliability.

An interview guide was also used to obtain deeper explanations regarding partnership practices, challenges, and possible interventions. School records and related documents supplied information on school size, population, and SBM performance.

2.5 Data-Gathering Procedure

Permission was sought from the Schools Division Superintendent. After approval, the researcher coordinated with concerned Public Schools District Supervisors and school heads. Respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, their role, and the procedures for answering the questionnaire. Questionnaires were administered to teachers, school heads, and school partners using printed forms and Google Forms according to respondent availability and preference. Completed instruments were retrieved, checked for completeness, organized, tabulated, and analyzed. Interviews with selected respondents supplemented the questionnaire data and helped identify issues, concerns, and possible components of the proposed partnership project.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

The source study reported observance of informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, privacy, and the right to withdraw without penalty. Personal information was to be used only for the purposes of the study and handled in accordance with the Philippine Data Privacy Act of 2012. The findings were presented without identifying individual respondents, schools, or stakeholder groups in a way that would disadvantage them.

2.7 Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage described school size, population, and SBM performance. Weighted mean and standard deviation summarized the extent of evidence of school-community partnership and coordination in the use of community resources. One-way ANOVA tested significant differences among teachers, school community representatives, and school heads; Scheffe test identified specific group differences when ANOVA results were significant. The source scoring scale was: 3.50-4.00 = Great Extent/Greatly Evident; 2.50-3.49 = Moderate Extent/Moderately Evident; 1.50-2.49 = Slight Extent; and 1.00-1.49 = Least Extent. The exact alpha level was not explicitly stated, although results were reported using $p < 0.01$ and $p = 0.01$ thresholds [VERIFY].

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Results

3.1.1 Profile of Schools in Area 4

Area 4 consisted of 103 schools. Most schools were medium-sized and had population levels classified between sparse and dense. SBM performance was concentrated in the Developing and Maturing levels, with only a small percentage classified as Advancing.

Table 1. Profile of schools in Area 4

Profile variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
School size	Small	6	5.83	3
School size	Medium	61	59.22	1
School size	Large	36	34.95	2
School population	Sparse	6	5.83	3
School population	Between sparse and dense	61	59.22	1
School population	Dense	36	34.95	2
SBM performance	Developing	49	47.57	1
SBM performance	Maturing	48	46.60	2
SBM performance	Advancing	6	5.83	3

Note. $n = 103$ schools.

3.1.2 Extent of Evidence of School-Community Partnership

The five partnership dimensions were all interpreted as greatly evident. Shared vision of learning and effective communication obtained the highest overall composite means of 3.68, followed by shared leadership and governance at 3.66. Complementary partnership and family engagement both obtained composite means of 3.65. School heads consistently rated each dimension higher than teachers and school community representatives.

Table 2. Composite assessment of school-community partnership dimensions

Dimension	Teachers WM (SD)	School community WM (SD)	School heads WM (SD)	Overall WM (SD)	VI
Shared vision of learning	3.67 (0.69)	3.64 (0.62)	3.82 (0.64)	3.68 (0.65)	GE
Shared leadership and governance	3.60 (0.52)	3.64 (0.49)	3.87 (0.50)	3.66 (0.50)	GE
Complementary partnership	3.57 (0.37)	3.65 (0.22)	3.89 (0.30)	3.65 (0.30)	GE
Effective communication	3.57 (0.50)	3.62 (0.50)	3.85 (0.50)	3.68 (0.50)	GE
Family engagement	3.59 (0.46)	3.65 (0.45)	3.87 (0.46)	3.65 (0.46)	GE

Note. WM = weighted mean; SD = standard deviation; VI = verbal interpretation; GE = greatly evident.

At the item level, several indicators identified areas for strengthening. In shared leadership and governance, collaboration with school personnel in designing the school development plan obtained the lowest overall mean ($M = 3.55$), and teachers rated this only moderately evident ($M = 3.47$). In complementary partnership, coordination in information dissemination had the lowest overall mean ($M = 3.55$), with teachers also rating it moderately evident ($M = 3.45$). In effective communication, face-to-face communication with stakeholders, private partners, and local government units obtained an overall mean of 3.49, interpreted as moderately evident. In family engagement, facilitating parent involvement in the educative process obtained the lowest overall mean ($M = 3.50$), with teachers ($M = 3.39$) and the school community ($M = 3.49$) rating it moderately evident.

3.1.3 Coordination with Communities in the Use of Resources

Coordination with communities in the use of resources was also greatly evident across all three assessed areas. Public relations and proper channeling both obtained composite means of 3.67, while follow-up obtained 3.66. School heads again gave the highest assessments across all areas.

Table 3. Composite assessment of coordination in the use of community resources

Resource-coordination area	Teachers WM (SD)	School community WM (SD)	School heads WM (SD)	Overall WM (SD)	VI
Public relations activities	3.61 (0.61)	3.66 (0.68)	3.87 (0.64)	3.67 (0.64)	GE
Follow-up	3.59 (0.67)	3.65 (0.70)	3.90 (0.69)	3.66 (0.69)	GE
Proper channeling	3.61 (0.64)	3.66 (0.64)	3.87 (0.64)	3.67 (0.64)	GE

Note. WM = weighted mean; SD = standard deviation; VI = verbal interpretation; GE = greatly evident.

For public relations, establishing strong community linkages through socialization activities obtained the highest overall mean ($M = 3.74$), while disseminating information about PTA programs and school development to the farthest extent possible obtained the lowest mean ($M = 3.60$). For follow-up, identifying recurring implementation problems and evaluating PTA officers both obtained the highest overall mean ($M = 3.72$), while checking the progress of joint programs obtained the lowest mean ($M = 3.54$); teachers rated progress checking moderately evident ($M = 3.45$). For proper channeling, abiding by legal requirements in channeling concerns had the highest mean ($M = 3.75$), while informing the Barangay Chairman about the status of joint programs had the lowest mean ($M = 3.58$).

3.1.4 Differences in Respondent Assessments

Significant differences were reported among respondent groups for the available partnership and resource-coordination dimensions. In general, school heads provided higher assessments than teachers and school community representatives. The uploaded manuscript reported ANOVA and Scheffé results for shared vision, shared leadership, complementary partnership, public relations, follow-up, and proper channeling.

Table 4. Reported differences among respondent-group assessments

Construct	ANOVA result	Scheffe results reported	Interpretation
Shared vision of learning	$F(2, 698) = 20.64; p < 0.01$	School heads vs teachers: $MD = 0.16, p < 0.01$; school heads vs school community: $MD = 0.18, p < 0.01$	Significant group differences; school heads rated higher.
Shared leadership and governance	$F(2, 698) = 66.36; p = 0.01$	Teachers vs school community: $MD = 0.05, p = 0.025$; school heads vs teachers: $MD = 0.27, p < 0.01$; school heads vs school community: $MD = 0.22, p < 0.01$	Significant group differences across respondent groups.
Complementary partnership	$F(2, 698) = 85.71; p < 0.01$	Teachers vs school community: $MD = 0.08, p < 0.01$; school heads vs teachers: $MD = 0.32, p = 0.01$; school heads vs school community: $MD = 0.24, p < 0.01$	Significant group differences; school heads rated highest.
Public relations	$F(2, 698) = 51.70; p < 0.01$	Teachers vs school community: $MD = 0.06, p < 0.01$; school heads vs teachers: $MD = 0.26, p < 0.01$; school heads vs school community: $MD = 0.21, p < 0.01$	Highly significant differences among groups.
Follow-up	$F = 84.45; p < 0.01$	MDs reported: 0.06, 0.31, and 0.25 among respective respondent pairs; exact pairwise p-values not provided [VERIFY]	Highly significant differences among groups.
Proper channeling	$F = 52.19; p < 0.01$	MDs reported: 0.05, 0.26, and 0.21 among respective respondent pairs; exact pairwise p-values not provided [VERIFY]	Highly significant differences among groups.

Note. MD = mean difference. For follow-up and proper channeling, the source reported pairwise mean differences but did not show exact pairwise p-values in the extracted text.

3.1.5 Issues and Concerns in School-Community Partnership

Interview findings identified five major issues. First, inadequate and delayed communication limited preparation time, reduced stakeholder response, and sometimes left community members feeling informed after decisions had already been made. Second, participation was constrained by work schedules, weekday meeting times, transportation difficulties, childcare responsibilities, and other accessibility barriers. Third, lack of trust and negative perceptions affected parent-teacher conversations, especially when learner performance or behavior concerns were interpreted as blame. Fourth, unclear roles, responsibilities, and proper channeling resulted in teacher overload, uncertainty among community partners, and concerns being brought to inappropriate offices or social media channels. Fifth, insufficient resources and lack of sustainability weakened projects that began with support but lacked funds, materials, volunteers, assigned personnel, monitoring systems, or transparent plans for continuation.

3.2 Discussion

The findings show a generally favorable pattern of school-community partnership in Area 4. All five partnership dimensions and all three resource-coordination areas were rated greatly evident. This suggests that schools and

stakeholders have existing mechanisms for common vision setting, shared participation, communication, family involvement, public relations, follow-up, and proper channeling. The results are consistent with partnership models that treat family and community engagement as a shared responsibility rather than an optional add-on to school operations (Epstein, 2018; Mapp & Bergman, 2019).

However, the results also show uneven perceptions among stakeholder groups. School heads consistently rated partnership and resource coordination more favorably than teachers and school community representatives. This may indicate that school heads are more directly exposed to administrative planning, formal reporting, and external coordination activities, while teachers and community members experience partnership through day-to-day communication, invitations, follow-up, and participation opportunities. The statistically significant differences therefore have practical importance: a partnership may be documented or visible to administrators while remaining less fully experienced by the people expected to implement or support it.

Several lower-rated items point to the same concern. Teachers rated collaboration in designing the school development plan, information dissemination, and monitoring of joint programs less strongly than school heads. The school community rated face-to-face communication with stakeholders, private partners, and local government units as less evident. Teachers and the school community also rated parent involvement in the educative process only moderately evident. These patterns suggest that partnership should move beyond meetings, socialization activities, and announcements toward more direct consultation, shared planning, and learning-centered engagement. This interpretation is consistent with family engagement literature emphasizing accessible, two-way, and relationship-based communication (Chappel & Ratliffe, 2021; Graham-Clay, 2024; Kelty & Wakabayashi, 2020).

The qualitative themes clarify why strong mean scores may coexist with persistent implementation issues. Delayed communication, low attendance, mistrust, unclear role assignment, and limited resources are not simply operational inconveniences; they affect whether stakeholders perceive the partnership as genuine, inclusive, and sustainable. Renbarger et al. (2025) similarly identified barriers to district, family, and community collaboration, including weak engagement models, limited training, unwelcoming environments, and deficit mindsets. In the present study, these barriers appeared in localized forms, such as late notices, weekday meetings, unclear contact persons, and concerns posted through unofficial channels.

The proposed enhancement program is therefore appropriate as a practical response, but it should be validated and piloted before wider implementation. The descriptive-comparative design does not establish that the proposed program will improve outcomes. Rather, the findings identify areas where improvement efforts should be targeted: earlier and more interactive communication, flexible participation options, transparent grievance and channeling procedures, stakeholder role clarification, progress monitoring, and resource-sustainability planning.

3.3 Practical Implications: Proposed School-Community Partnership Enhancement Program

Based on the results, the source study proposed a School-Community Partnership Enhancement Program for Area 4. The program is intended to strengthen stakeholder relationships, institutionalize shared responsibility, improve information dissemination, increase parent and community participation, and establish clearer procedures for follow-up and proper channeling. The proposed components are summarized below.

Table 5. Proposed program components

Area	Project title	Core activities	Intended indicators
Shared vision of learning	SHARE-U (Synergy with Heart to Achieve Responsible Emergence and Unity)	Symposiums or forums on school programs, goals, curriculum, and social objectives; parent-teacher conferences; leadership training; open forums; general PTA conferences.	Improved stakeholder relationships, institutionalized sharing of responsibilities, and stronger collaboration to reduce barriers.
Shared leadership and governance	PUSH-HIM (Priming Unity and Shared Harmony-Having Integrated Management)	Regular parent-teacher conferences, general assemblies, seminars, team-building activities, training, workshops, recollections, and PTA conferences.	More parent participation in PTA processes, community-leader participation in school programs, and collaboration in development planning.
Complementary partnership	SELECT (Secured and Enhanced Locality Embraced Contributor Leading to Teamwork)	Alumni homecoming, fundraising activities, fun run, Brigada Eskwela activities, dinner or concert for a cause, LGU dialogues, social media dissemination, tarpaulin posting, and Project Kumustahan.	Stakeholder financial or material support, agency linkages, and dissemination of school program information.

Area	Project title	Core activities	Intended indicators
Public relations activities	I-GOLD (Initiative of Gathering Opportunities to Lasting Development)	PTA conferences, parent-teacher orientation, alumni meetings, signature-for-a-cause activities, team-building, training, workshops, and Project UGNAYAN for platform-based updates.	Resource sharing, stronger relations with barangay officials and parents, and full dissemination of PTA programs and projects.
Follow-up	SOLVE (Solution and Opportunity Leading to Achieved Vision of Everyone)	Parent-teacher orientation, family day, parenting seminars or webinars, communication workshops, monitoring, evaluation and adjustment activities, and bulletin-board updating.	Parent invitations, solution tracking, and monitoring of joint-program implementation.
Proper channeling	FIRM (Formal and Reasonable Management and Projects)	Orientation on proper channeling and communication channels, barangay conferences, regular updates, formal letters, emails, chats, calls, and online meetings.	Implementation of proper-channeling policies and regular updates to key stakeholders on school concerns and program status.

3.4 Limitations

The study relied on self-reported assessments from teachers, school community representatives, and school heads. Responses may have been influenced by role expectations, familiarity with school programs, or personal experiences. The study was limited to 103 schools in Area 4, Division of Batangas; therefore, findings may not be generalizable to other divisions or regions.

The design was descriptive-comparative and did not test the causal effect of partnership practices on student achievement, learner behavior, school climate, or long-term institutional outcomes. The proposed enhancement program was developed from the findings but was not implemented or evaluated within the study period. Several methodological and statistical details require author verification before journal submission, including exact respondent-group counts, sampling method, reliability coefficients, interviewee selection, and some ANOVA results.

4 Conclusion

The schools in Area 4 were predominantly medium-sized and moderately populated, and most were at the Developing or Maturing level of SBM performance. School-community partnership and coordination in the use of community resources were generally greatly evident. Nevertheless, school heads consistently gave higher assessments than teachers and school community representatives, and statistically significant differences were found across several dimensions. The positive quantitative assessments should therefore be interpreted alongside the qualitative concerns: delayed communication, limited participation, mistrust, unclear roles and channeling, and insufficient resources. A School-Community Partnership Enhancement Program is warranted, but it should be validated, piloted, monitored, and revised based on stakeholder feedback and implementation evidence.

4.1 Recommendations

- Submit the proposed School-Community Partnership Enhancement Program to school heads and appropriate division officials for review, refinement, and validation.
- Pilot the program in selected schools and monitor implementation using clear indicators for communication timeliness, stakeholder participation, role clarity, resource mobilization, follow-up, and proper channeling.
- Strengthen participation by offering flexible meeting schedules, online and face-to-face options, acknowledgement mechanisms, designated contact persons, and accessible feedback channels.
- Conduct further research including learner achievement, learner behavior, socioeconomic factors, school climate, organizational culture, funding, teacher competence, digital communication platforms, stakeholder satisfaction, and policy implementation.

5 References

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2019). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press. [VERIFY original publication year and edition used].
- Chappel, J., & Ratliffe, K. T. (2021). Factors impacting positive school-home communication: A multiple case study of family-school partnership practices in eight elementary schools in Hawai'i. *School Community Journal*, 31(2), 9-30. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1323052.pdf>
- Coleman, J. S. (2018). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement), S95-S120. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228943> [VERIFY source year/edition].

- Department of Education. (2012). DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012: Implementing guidelines on the revised School-Based Management framework, assessment process, and tool.
- Department of Education. (2024). DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the revised School-Based Management system.
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494673>
- Graham-Clay, S. (2024). Communicating with parents 2.0: Strategies for teachers. *School Community Journal*, 34(1), 9-60.
- Kelty, N. E., & Wakabayashi, T. (2020). Family engagement in schools: Parent, educator, and community perspectives. *SAGE Open*, 10(4), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020973024>
- Mapp, K. L., & Bergman, E. (2019). Dual capacity-building framework for family-school partnerships (Version 2). Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships.
- Renbarger, R., Rodler, L., Espina, G., Thompson, A., Detgen, A., Sobers, M., Fernandez, F., Sackman, R., Williams, P., & Newsome, E. (2025). Roadblocks to effective district, family, and community collaboration: A phenomenology study of potential challenges and solutions. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 24(2), 384-400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2024.2317298>
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.