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Abstract
One of the Department of Education’s initiatives to increase the literacy rate in the Philippines has been the conversion of elementary schools into integrated schools, meaning, a high school department is created or added. In the Northern Luzon area particularly in Ilocos Norte and Laoag City, nine elementary schools have been converted into Integrated Schools. This is to make sure that those who graduate from these schools will continue their schooling as these are practically located in isolated places. Unfortunately, the transformation of these elementary schools into integrated schools poses interesting challenges to the present school administrators because from managing just an elementary school, they already need to oversee the operation of an elementary and a high school and now with an added two-year Senior High School in one campus. This means, their responsibilities have become doubled if not multiplied. This phenomenological study, therefore, aimed to develop a model based on the practices of the school administrators of integrated schools in the management of their respective institutions. Results of the interviews and focused group discussions reveal that there are management practices that are common to the integrated schools. However, some practices were also found to be unique to the schools. These practices reflect their coping strategies toward the limitations accompanying the changes in structure, instruction, and system of operation in the school. From these practices in managing change, processes and approaches were identified and a transformational model of management for integrated schools was subsequently designed.
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Introduction

The value of education particularly in a developing country like the Philippines cannot be underestimated. It is believed as the tool that could transform a person to live a better life and more importantly a socially well-being. According to Dolan (1991), education is the primary avenue for upward social and economic mobility. All in all, it is one’s education which decides what one can make out of his/her life.

In addition to the Philippine Constitution, the right of every Filipino to quality basic education is further emphasized in Republic Act 9155 or the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. Along with Republic Act 6655 or the Free Secondary Education Act, these laws reaffirm the policy of the State to protect and promote the rights of all Filipinos by providing children free and compulsory education in the elementary and high school level.

Corollary to this, the Philippines came up with the Philippine Education for All 2015 National Action Plan entitled, Functionally Literate Filipinos, an Educated Nation. The EFA 2015 Plan emphasizes the need to provide basic education for all and adds a dimension to what has been thus far almost exclusively school-based education. It points to an “urgent need to respond to the learning needs of youth and adults who are either have never been to school, have dropped out, reverted to illiteracy, or need basic or advanced skills to find jobs.” It suggests a “viable alternative learning system” to formal schooling that together with the schools can ensure that “minimum learning achievement will be a reality for all Filipinos.” Thus, the EFA 2015 Plan emphasizes that educational opportunities are channels of learning which can become effective conduits of values orientation, consciousness and information useful and relevant to a wide range of social goals (UNESCO, 2015).

In accordance with the broadening of accessibility to basic education, the program commitment has the following components: a) establishment of a school in every barangay not having an elementary school and in every town without a high school; b) organization of multi-grade classrooms; c) completion of incomplete elementary schools; and d) provision of basic instructional materials, facilities and equipment at the elementary and high school levels (Department of Education, 2006).

Related to the first commitment, several elementary schools nationwide have been converted into integrated schools to make sure that those who graduate from elementary schools who have to travel several kilometers away from the nearest high school will continue schooling. Observations show that a number of elementary graduates especially from far-flung areas would find it difficult to move to the next ladder of education because there is no accessible high school in the area, or that, there is a high school but it is several kilometers away. Parents even admit that the expenses their children have to spend for travel to the nearest high school are such a burden to them.

In Ilocos Norte and Laoag City, nine elementary schools have been converted into Integrated Schools to help achieve the goals of EFA 2015. Some of these schools have already the complete regular four-year curriculum and are starting even to offer Senior High School effective June 2016.
Unfortunately, the transformation of these elementary schools into integrated schools poses interesting challenges to the present school administrators because from managing just an elementary school, they already need to oversee the operation of an elementary and a high school with an added two-year Senior High School in one campus. This means, their responsibilities have become doubled if not multiplied.

Generally, school administrators, also known as the school principals, are responsible for the overall operation of their schools – from leading school reforms that would raise student achievement to facilitating the school’s interactions with parents and other stakeholders in the community, developing school discipline policies and enforcing them, ensuring that facilities and equipment are available, safe and in good working order, and preparing and submitting reports and documents.

More specifically, the NCBSSH or National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads (2010) defines the different dimensions of being an effective school administrator. It clearly states that an effective school administrator is one who can implement continuous school improvement, who can produce better learning outcomes among its pupils/students and who can help change institutional culture among others. All these become even more challenging when the school administrator manages an integrated school.

Certainly, administrators of integrated schools oversee a complex operation and according to one author, strong principals may be the single most important factor in determining the effectiveness of a school. As Larry Payne, Director of the University of Houston-based Institute for Urban Education has stressed: The principal is the principle, and everything flows from there (Markley, 1996).

Empirical researches have been conducted along educational management and leadership. But after almost a decade since the establishment of integrated schools in the province, no research along documenting the practices and difficulties of school administrators managing integrated schools has been recorded or published yet. A study on such a concern that could eventually lead to the drawing out of a management model that could guide not only the administrators of other integrated schools in the country but also those of single schools is, therefore, deemed significant.

This study therefore aimed to develop a model for the management of integrated schools in the Philippines. Specifically, it sought answers to the following:

1. How do school administrators manage their integrated schools along the seven domains of school leadership and management namely:
   a) school leadership;
   b) instructional leadership;
   c) creating a student-centered learning climate;
   d) human resource management and professional development;
   e) parent involvement and community partnership;
   f) school management and operations; and
   g) personal and professional attributes and interpersonal effectiveness?
2. What model can be developed in the management of integrated schools?

Literature Review

The Principal as a School Administrator

As stipulated in DepEd Order number 17, s. 1997 titled, "Adopting a Policy of Empowering School Principals," all public elementary and secondary school principals are vested with instructional administrative and fiscal autonomy for a more effective and efficient delivery of quality basic education.

Related to this, a full-fledged school principal in every complete public elementary and secondary school is given a plantilla item provided they have passed the qualifying examination for principals. Teachers who are designated “officers-in-charge” or “teachers-in-charge” of schools shall be upgraded to become plantilla items of school principals in the said schools. School principal items shall be considered of equal rank and salary grade whether for the elementary or secondary schools.

Moreover, DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2007 stipulates the qualifications of a school head. A school head is a person responsible for the administrative and instructional supervision of the school or cluster of schools. As such, the school head is expected to possess the following leadership dimensions: educational leadership – the ability to craft and pursue a shared school vision and mission, as well as develop and implement curriculum policies, programs and projects; people leadership – the ability to work and develop effective relationships with stakeholders and exert a positive influence upon people; and strategic leadership – the ability to explore complex issues from a global perspective, manage an educational enterprise and maximize the use of resources. In addition to these and to passing the national qualifying test, applicants for principal positions must possess the following criteria: performance; experience and outstanding accomplishments; education and training; potential; and psycho-social attributes and personality traits.

National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads

The National Competency Standards for School Heads are contained in the DepEd Order No. 32 series of 2010, also known as “The National Adoption and Implementation of the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads.” This framework defines the different dimensions of being an effective school head. It clearly states that an effective school head is one who can implement continuous school improvement, who can produce better learning outcomes among its pupils/students and who can help change institutional culture among others.

The competencies identified for the school heads are classified into seven domains for school leadership and management. These include: school leadership, instructional leadership, creating a student-centered learning climate, HR management and professional development, parent involvement and community partnership, school management and operations, and personal and professional attributes and interpersonal effectiveness.
School leadership. Effective leadership is the core of every successful school. This domain emphasizes that effective school leaders collaboratively create a vision and establish a climate for teachers, non-teaching personnel and learners to reach their highest level of achievement.

Instructional leadership. Education reforms have created an urgent need for strong emphasis on the development of instructional leadership skills. This domain covers those actions in instructional leadership (e.g. assessment for learning, development and implementation, instructional supervision and technical assistance that school administrators take or delegate to others to promote good teaching and high level learning among pupils/students.

Creating a student-centered learning climate. The domain requires that effective school leaders set high standards and create high expectations for learners at the same time recognizing their achievement.

HR management and professional development. Effective school leaders develop the skills and talents of those around them. This domain includes the nurturing and supporting of a learning community that recruits teachers based on NCBTS and promotes the continuous growth and development of personnel based on IPPD and SPPD.

Parent involvement and community partnership. Effective school administrators engage in shared decision making with the community in achieving universal participation, completion and functional literacy. This domain covers parent and other stakeholders’ involvement to raise learners’ performance.

School management and operations. This domain covers the critical role school administrators play in managing the implementation and monitoring of their schools’ improvement plan/annual implementation plan.

Personal and professional attributes and interpersonal effectiveness. Effective school leaders are models of professionalism and ethical and moral leadership. This domain includes the development of pride in the nobility of the teaching profession.

These same seven domains with their accompanying competencies were used in this study as bases for describing the practices of and challenges encountered by the school administrators in managing integrated schools.

Conversion of Elementary Schools into Integrated Schools

Observations from previous years show that there have been an alarming low participation rate of high school students and a relatively high dropout rate, particularly from those living in areas with no secondary school or with a secondary school but is about 8-10 kilometers away.

With this scenario, parents find it costly to send their children to a distant school which requires them to spend a considerable amount for transportation excluding school and food allowances. It is usually this financial constraint that prevents the students from continuing their secondary education and leading them to dropping out of school.
The transformation of elementary schools into integrated schools is mandated by DECS Order number 91 s, 1999. This order allows elementary schools to offer secondary education particularly to qualified schools where their distance to a nearest public high school is at least 8 kilometers.

The conversion, therefore, of eligible elementary schools into integrated schools opened an opportunity for children to enter high school and pursue their education until they graduate. This is not only less costly for parents but is also more convenient on the part of students who would travel only a short distance to reach the school. Moreover, the conversion of qualified elementary schools into integrated schools is expected to utilize a more efficient operation of the Local Educational System in the municipality and to encourage students who dropped out to return to school and finish their basic education. Subsequently, this would give them the opportunity to obtain the quality of education that they deserve and become future leaders and professionals of the province and of the country in general.

Once the elementary school is converted into an integrated school by virtue of a House Bill enacted by the Congress, endorsed by the Senate and later approved by the President to become a law, all personnel including the school principal, assets, liabilities and records are transferred and absorbed by the integrated school and that the Secretary of Education will be directed to immediately include in the Department’s program and operationalization of the school, the funding of which shall be included in the annual General Appropriations Act (GAA).

This set-up makes the role, duties and responsibilities of the school principal/administrator doubly challenging and complex.

**Models of Educational Management**

Two of the best known frameworks of educational management are those by Bolam and Deal (1991) and Morgan (1997). However, in this study, Bush’s (2007) main theories which are classified into six major models of educational management were highlighted. These models which include formal, collegial, political, subjective, ambiguity and cultural, also parallel leadership models. For instance, in the formal model, administrators possess authority legitimized by their formal positions within the organization and are accountable to sponsoring bodies for the activities of their organization. The type of leadership therefore that is most closely associated with this model is **transformational** or **managerial**. **Managerial leadership** assumes that the focus of leaders ought to be on functions, tasks and behaviors and that if these functions are carried out competently the work of others in the organization will be facilitated (Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1999).

In the collegial model, power is shared among some or all members of the organization who are thought to have a shared understanding about the aims of the institution; hence, the type of leadership associated with this model is participative leadership. In the political model, policy and decisions emerge through a process of negotiation and bargaining; thus, the type of leadership associated with this model is **transactional leadership**. In the subjective model, each person is considered with a subjective and selective perception of the organization; hence, is associated with the
post-modern leadership. In the ambiguity model, uncertainty and unpredictability in organizations are stressed thus in a climate of ambiguity, traditional notions of leadership require modification. Lastly, the cultural model focuses on the values, beliefs and norms of individuals which make the heart of organizations thus is paralleled with the moral type of leadership.

Essentially, a management’s success is dependent on the extent to which each role in the organization is fulfilled. It is believed that for effective management, an organization ought to bring together a team of leaders that, when working together in harmony, can scale the most complex and dynamic of issues.

Methodology

This study made use of phenomenological research in analyzing and interpreting narrative data. Data were therefore gathered from the principals/school administrators of the eight Integrated Schools in Laoag City and in Ilocos Norte through semi-structured interview. Some stakeholders like parents and barangay officials were also interviewed.

Prior to the official conduct of the interviews, the interview schedule was tried out to one former integrated school administrator. This was done to determine the clarity and validity of the questions in terms of soliciting answers to the identified problems of this study. From this, minor modifications on some questions were done. The Integrated School where the interview schedule was tried out was still part of the participants. The interviews were recorded which were later transcribed, encoded and interpreted. Field notes were also used.

Prior to the gathering of data, permission was granted from the Schools Division Superintendents of both the divisions of Ilocos Norte and Laoag City. All the participants were provided a copy of the Informed Consent Form and the aims of the research. The nature of the study was also discussed with them by the researcher. Requests were communicated to them to participate in the study on a voluntary basis. In addition, signed consent was obtained from all the participants prior to the gathering of data and they were assured that no identifying information would be included in any part of the research report. All the participants were likewise assured that the information they would be providing would be used only for this study and that they were informed that they could withdraw from the study without any risk or penalty. Lastly, the participants gave their consent to the dissemination of the results of the study and that they could have access to the results at the MMSU Graduate School library in Laoag and at the MMSU Main Library in Batac.

Discussion

There are salient practices of the integrated schools that were identified. Some of these are common to them all. However, there are also practices unique to each of them. These practices were consolidated along the domains of school leadership prescribed in the NCBSSH.
School Leadership

According to the NCBSSH (2010), effective leadership is the core of every successful school. This domain emphasizes that effective school leaders collaboratively create a vision and establish a climate for teachers, non-teaching personnel and learners to reach their highest level of achievement.

Based on the results of the interviews, the school administrators of the integrated schools practice democratic leadership style as manifested in their approaches in managing their respective institutions. They encourage creativity, and team members are often highly engaged in projects and decisions. The administrators’ approaches include: a) communicating the vision, mission, goals and objectives of their schools; b) capability and team building; c) unifying workforce; d) collegial problem solving; e) leading by example; and f) managing change.

Communicating the vision, mission, goals and objectives of their schools. From the initial take off as an integrated school, it has become a culture of these schools in their subsequent operations that the vision, mission, goals and objectives of DepEd and their schools are presented and deliberated each year through a meeting with the stakeholders particularly during their first general assembly at the start of the school year. However, prior to the dissemination process, the administration and the teachers deliberate among themselves first to ensure uniformity in interpretation. This is reflected in the following claims:

“I explain the vision, mission, goals and objectives of DepEd through a general assembly meeting with the stakeholders. We discuss these in meetings, especially PTA general assembly meetings to ask our stakeholders what they can do to support DepEd in general and our school in particular.” -Myra

Capability and team building is conducted at a quarterly basis complimenting the Learner Action Center (LAC) being held every Thursday where teachers also engage in the collaborative development of learning materials.

Unifying workforce. Promoting unity and cohesive relationship is sustained by all the administrators. Since everyone is in themselves beginners, their integration made them learn from their own experiences and explore on possible actions particularly at times of crisis brought about by budgetary, human and material resources constraints.

Collegial problem solving. Evidently, the school administrators employ various strategies in approaching problems in their respective institutions which are considered situation-and-person specific. One is resolving integration issues. As a means to resolve an issue, the school administrators use their convincing powers to encourage the teachers to embrace changes. As some teachers narrated:

“… we were motivated and encouraged by the principal that the inclusion of high school in our school will benefit many students in our place.” “Namaymayat ta bassit ngamin ti
mabayadan ti public school ngem ti private schools.”
(“Benefited in the sense that it would be a public school, minimal fees would be collected compared to the expensive fees in the private schools.”) – Mimi

Another is resolving conflicts. The administrators under study were found to be both an arbitrator and a conciliator in resolving internal and external conflicts. This could be gauged from the contention of the administrators who shared:

“…We solve problems at the school level. I assist teachers and students to understand the problem and identify possible solutions.” - Remie
“I talked with the PTA, I talked with the teachers and together, we solved the problem. They accepted their fault and the matter was solved.” – Miriam

Interestingly, problems related to lack of classrooms, dearth of teachers, enrolment, lack of learning resources, school drop-outs, and land dispute were addressed with the principal tapping all possible stakeholders of the school.

Leading by example and managing change. Leading is not merely a matter of telling what needs to be done. To carry out things in accordance with the plan, the school administrators had to be more of a demonstrator rather than teller. As the teachers disclosed:

“…She sets example, sir. No agob-obra isuna, ayabannakami tapno kano ammominto met ti agobra.”
(When she is working, she calls for us to show what she is doing for us to be oriented.) – Mimi

In terms of managing change, the experience of two school administrators were highlighted. One school administrator did not suffer the rigor of introducing change as the integration was started by her predecessor. She claimed:

“For the seven months that I am here, sir, my first concern is to continue the works of my predecessor. I have to continue what they had started like the facilities, the physical plant, and improvement of the teachers-like promotion.” – Remie

That of the other school administrator is unique, the constituents and the service community crave for change. He shared:

“… when I came here, all teachers were disoriented because the former administrator was about to retire then, they were somewhat neglected. But when I came, it’s good that they were not resistant to change. They wanted change. Even the mentality of the parents here, previously, and even the alumni, they were not active in supporting the school because they could not see change.” – Rogie
Generally, however, the school administrators instituted change in their respective schools. To carry out the planned change, they instituted some identified measures to minimize resistance and tension following democratic leadership.

**Instructional Leadership**

The administration and teachers were found to be aggressive in their desire to improve instruction. It could be noted that the first sets of teachers that manned the secondary program were elementary oriented. Further, the demands of the new curriculum, the K to 12 program, is quite challenging that they have to exert so much effort to address dearth of instructional materials. Mentoring particularly on the fundamentals of computer by teachers who are computer literate made them survive the challenges. The aggressive involvement of other stakeholders such as the parents, alumni and community enabled them to put up facilities in aid of instruction.

The religious implementation of the LAC propelled production of more instructional materials complimented by the teachers own collections downloaded electronically. Likewise, their building connections with other schools and alumni, and strong involvement of the parents, made them improve library collections.

Their active participation in activities spearheaded by professional organizations such as the MTAP compliment the teaching and learning activities. Adherence to the standards of test construction guide them in assessing students’ performance. Although department heads are empowered to directly supervise their constituents, surprise visit is being done by the principals to determine other classroom and instructional needs rather than evaluating methods and pedagogy.

**Creating a Student-Centered Learning Climate**

The strong participation and involvement of parents, community and alumni, in addition to the support provided by DepEd itself, enabled them to put up technology facility to support computer education and computer technology program to develop the skills of students particularly in that track and as take-off point for teachers to a multi-media mode of delivering instruction.

Worth noting is the involvement of the barangay council particularly the barangay tanod who help ensure student security. The creation of the Child Protection Committee ascertains protection of the rights of the students and prevents child abuse in the campus. In addition, a guard is hired by the PTA to oversee student security within the school.

Classroom environment is structured in a manner that they are conducive to student learning. Proper lighting and ventilation is facilitated from the support of parents in materials and labor.

**Human Resource Management and Professional Development**

Capability and team building surfaced in most of the schools. The innate potentials of the teachers were identified and their services are being tapped to assist in some management operations. With the strong motivation of the principals, the teachers
participate in trainings and seminars at their own expense, and more importantly, to pursue graduate studies – all to provide for their professional development.

The empowerment of the department heads and coordinators made the teachers self-propelling. More significantly, coaching and mentoring is prominent among the schools which enabled the schools to self-organize and learn from their own experiences.

A one-on-one feedback is observed for teachers to be made aware of areas they need to improve on. In terms of student performance, they are consulted individually to provide for appropriate alternative measures to address their learning needs.

Although a committee is tasked to evaluate their performance, their process allows teachers to assist in the appraisal of their own credentials in aid of ranking and promotion. Every teacher has his/her Individual Professional Plan Development (IPPD) in place which guides them in their daily activities throughout the school year. This also serves as basis for their performance evaluation.

**Parent Involvement and Community Partnership**

The assistance extended by parents, the community, the local government unit (LGU) and alumni is unquestionable. Besides providing financial assistance, parents volunteer to help in the maintenance of the campus and security of school properties. Repairs of facilities especially electrical, carpentry and construction works, are handled by parents – without asking for remuneration.

Rapport with the community appeared to be highly manifested as evidenced by their full participation and involvement in school activities particularly during fund raising projects. What is more unique is the recognition of the parents’ efforts, especially those who are actively involved in helping in the development of the school, where they are awarded certificates of recognition at the end of each school year. These are the services they offer beyond the usual activities in the Brigada Eskwela.

**School Management and Operations**

Another important characteristic of most of the integrated schools is that of the principals’, department heads’ and teachers’ sharing of responsibility. The culture of mutual, collaborative and coordinated responsibility exist in schools making the principals’ work less tedious and less stressful.

**Personal and Professional Attributes and Interpersonal Effectiveness**

The principals were found to possess positive personality traits characteristic of democratic leaders. Their being open-minded leads to a more collaborative decision-making where teachers, parents and other stakeholders could freely provide suggestions in order to solve problems. They are not only leaders, they too, are followers. They work without necessarily seeking assistance from others and whose actions signal the rest of the teachers to also move and do their part.
Transparency is evident in most of the integrated schools. Canvassing and acquisition of school supplies is handled by a committee, even donations and collections are managed by them and reported to parents. Further, parents are regularly informed on the developments in the school and needs are presented in aid of planning and formulating strategies to address them.

Internal equity is the secret of some integrated schools where faculty are treated fairly especially when it comes to evaluation of their performance. Their being consulted and participation in the evaluation of their IPPD and credentials make them aware of how they faired in the general assessment.

**Management Model**

A careful analysis of the practices of the integrated schools led to the development of a model dubbed as **Transformational Model of Management for Integrated Schools** (Figure 1).

The integrated schools are relatively young. As of the moment, the schools have not gained full status as an integrated school since the current curriculum year being implemented in the secondary level is still at Grade 11. Two stages of development were therefore identified: **Initiation Phase** and **Transition Phase**. The first phase covers the initial year of implementation of the conversion while the second is from the second year onward. These schools are considered to be still in the Transition stage.

Based on the experiences of the integrated schools, as reflected in the disclosures of the administrators, teachers, parents and community leaders, 10 Cs surfaced in their practices: Convince, Campaign, Communicate, Collaborate, Cooperate, Coordinate, Control, Consult, Connect and Compensate. These processes do not necessarily come in succession, they are situation-and-function specific.

In summing up, the model developed is an offshoot of the new leadership initiatives under the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and National Competency Standards for School Heads (NCSSH) which gave more autonomy to school leaders and teachers to lead and manage schools. The system identified the domains upon which the administrators, together with the stakeholders, could draw initiatives in the development of the school. Emphasis is on innovation and to instill greater professionalism in the management of schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAINS</th>
<th>PROCESSES</th>
<th>APPROACHES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School leadership</td>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>Deliberate vision, mission, goals and values development with school and community Integration of students in school activities, programs and projects Resolving integration issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Enhancing school community Training, coaching, and mentoring of teachers Development and implementation of plans for school improvement Capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>Building blocks with teachers, parents, community Building relationships with community members and community organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>Resolving conflicts and external problems Utilization of facilities Integration of facilities and creation of committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor leadership</td>
<td>Convince</td>
<td>Encouraging support of parents, barangay leaders, and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>Teaching assistance of poor or nonpayers in quality schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Teaching student discipline with parents and community Teaching teaching methods and subject pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>Coaching and mentoring of teachers Implementation of the learning action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>Building blocks with teachers, parents, community Building relationships with community members and community organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resolving conflicts and external problems Utilization of facilities Integration of facilities and creation of committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creating a student-centered learning environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>Shaping student-centered learning environment Shaping student-centered learning environment Shaping student-centered learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pulling up of teachers' learning Taking responsibility for student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>Encouraging participation and development of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>Enhancing student and teacher's performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>Shaping student-centered learning environment Shaping student-centered learning environment Shaping student-centered learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resolving conflicts and external problems Utilization of facilities Integration of facilities and creation of committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural Teacher management and professional development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>Practical experience in schools Practical experience in schools Practical experience in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Teaching and mentoring of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>Resolving conflicts and external problems Utilization of facilities Integration of facilities and creation of committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect</td>
<td>Shaping student-centered learning environment Shaping student-centered learning environment Shaping student-centered learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resolving conflicts and external problems Utilization of facilities Integration of facilities and creation of committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lastly, the model is reflective of the complexity theory of educational management. The Complexity theory (Ng, 2015) establishes the founding knowledge in understanding the school as a complex organization, as well as an important stakeholder in addressing national demands. The growing complexity in the management of the integrated school is marked with processes and approaches in dealing with concerns particularly during their transition period which could be a benchmark for other schools of similar situation, as well as already established schools, to model upon.

**Conclusion**

In their efforts to self-organize, the integrated schools implemented measures to cope with the challenges brought about by changes in their organizational set up and system of operation. As they cope with these challenges, practices evolved in order for them to survive the trials of conversion and ensure that no activity is jeopardized despite budgetary constraints and limited resources.

In their struggles to survive and overcome restrictions, they developed a unique organizational culture that enables them to keep their schools going and more importantly, the management of changes in the organization.
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